



Cornell University Library

The original of this book is in
the Cornell University Library.

There are no known copyright restrictions in
the United States on the use of the text.

Cornell University Library
E185.61 .B62

A social history of the American Negro,



3 1924 032 554 457

olin

BLACK POLITICAL SCIENTISTS AND BLACK SURVIVAL

Essays in Honor of A Black Scholar

Shelby Lewis Smith Editor

BLACK POLITICAL SCIENTISTS AND BLACK SURVIVAL

Essays in honor of a black scholar

Edited by

Shelby Lewis Smith
Department of Political Science
Atlanta University



Balamp Publishing
Detroit, Michigan 48202

E
185
•61
B62

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data
Main entry under title:

Black political scientists and Black survival.

A collection by American political scientists honoring
Jewel Limar Prestage.

Bibliography: p.

1. Afro-Americans — Politics and suffrage — Addresses, essays,
lectures. 2. United States — Race relations — Addresses, essays,
lectures. 3. Prestage, Jewel Limar, 1931- I. Smith, Shelby
Lewis, 1940- II. Prestage, Jewel Limar, 1931-
E185.61.B59 301.45'19'6073 77-5458
ISBN 0-913642-07-X

Printed in the United States of America
Copyright © 1977 by Balamp Publishing. All rights reserved.
ISBN 0-913642-07-X

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

BALAMP PUBLISHING
7430 Second Blvd.
Detroit, Mich. 48202

82
scb



Dr. Prestage

BIOGRAPHICAL

Professor Jewel Limar Prestage was born in Hutton, La. on August 12, 1931, one of 16 children of Brudis Leroy Limar and Sallie Bell Johnson Limar. Her early education was received in the rural public schools of Vernon Parish, La. Later, the family moved to Alexandria where she completed elementary and high school, the latter in 1948. At Southern University (Baton Rouge), she studied political science, receiving the B.A. degree in 1951, *Summa Cum Laude*. Graduate study in political science was commenced in 1951 at the University of Iowa with the assistance of a GEB Fellowship from the Rockefeller Foundation. The M.A. degree was conferred in 1952. Upon receipt of the Ph.D. degree in 1954, she became the first American black woman known to have received this degree in political science.

From 1954 to 1956, Prof. Prestage taught political science at Prairie View A & M University in Texas. In 1956, she began an association with the Department of Political Science at her alma mater which has lasted until now. Since 1965 she has served as chairperson of her department. She holds membership in a number of professional and scholarly organizations including the American Political Science Association, the National Conference of Black Political Scientists, the Southern Political Science Association, and the Southwestern Social Science Association, among others. Among the offices she has held are the following: President of the Southwestern Social Science Assoc.; Executive Councillor and Vice President of the American Political Science Assoc.; Executive Councillor, Recording Secretary, Vice President, and President of the Southern Political Science Association; and President of the National Conference of Black Political Scientists.

Grants and Fellowships awarded to Prof. Prestage have come from the U. S. Office of Education, the National Science Foundation, and the Ford Foundation. Among her many publications are, "Black Politics and the Kerner Report: Concerns & Directions" (*Social Sci. Quart.* 49: 453-464, 1968); "Black Women

Officeholders: The Case of State Legislators" (in Laurily Epstein's *Women in the Professions*, 1975, D. C. Heath: Lexington); and *Women in the American Political Arena: A Portrait in Marginality* (with Marianne Githens), 1976, David McKay: N.Y.).

Prof. Prestage's other involvements have included chairperson of the Louisiana State Advisory Committee to the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, member of the board of the Southern Regional Council, and member of the policy board for the Department of Higher Education of the National Council of Churches of Christ, U.S.A. She is married to Dr. James Jordan Prestage, and they have five children (ages 7 through 21).

CONTRIBUTORS

SAMUEL DUBOIS COOK, Ph.D.

President of Dillard University
New Orleans, Louisiana

WILLIAM JEFFERSON, J.D.

Legislative Assistant to Senator Bennett Johnston
Washington, D. C.

MACK HENRY JONES, Ph.D.

Chairman and Professor of Political Science, Atlanta
University
Atlanta, Georgia

ROY A. KENNIX, MPA

Assistant to the Chancellor, Atlanta University Center
Atlanta, Georgia

MAE C. KING, Ph.D.

Staff Associate, American Political Science Association and
Adjunct Professor of Political Science, Howard University
Washington, D. C.

ADOLPH REED, SR., M.A.

Associate Professor of Political Science, University of
Arkansas
Fayetteville, Arkansas

SHELBY LEWIS SMITH, Ph.D.

Associate Professor of Political Science, Atlanta University
Atlanta, Georgia

HANES WALTON, JR., Ph.D.

Professor of Political Science, Savannah State College
Savannah, Georgia

ALEX WILLINGHAM, Ph.D.

Associate Professor of Political Science, Atlanta University
Atlanta, Georgia

DEDICATED
TO
JEWEL LIMAR PRESTAGE
*Teacher, Colleague, Scholar,
Friend, and Outstanding
Human Being.*

CONTENTS

Preface	ix
Introduction: Essays In Honor Of A Black Scholar — Jewel Limar Prestage, by Hanes Walton, Jr.	1
Responsibility Of Black Political Scientists to The Black Community, by Mack H. Jones	9
Black Independent Political Movements: Research Notes, by Shelby L. Smith	18
The Political Role Of The Stereotyped Image Of The Black Woman In America, by Mae C. King	24
Racism And Sexism: A Double Tragedy Issuing From A Single Source, by Samuel DuBois Cook	45
A Question Of Authority, by William Jefferson	54
The Works And Experiences Of Daniel P. Moynihan: A Rationale For Black Genocide And A Journey In A Circle, by Roy A. Kennix	64
What Has Really Changed?, by Adolph Reed, Sr.	81
I'm Not A Crook's Successor, by Adolph Reed, Sr.	85
Nation-building As Protracted Struggle: The Role Of Education, by Shelby L. Smith	89

PREFACE

This commemorative volume represents a selected sample of the works sent in by black political scientists for inclusion in a book of collected essays dedicated to Jewel Limar Prestage. We apologize to those whose essays were not selected, but the fact that all who wanted to contribute to the volume were unable to do so is a testimonial to the status of Jewel among the ranks of black political scientists.

As black political scientists, we indicate our recognition and appreciation for Jewel's contribution to each of us specifically and to the black community in general through the publication of this volume.

The selected essays range from an analysis of the significance of honoring black scholars via collected essays to research notes; theoretical models; critiques on sexism and racism; the black family and the American educational system. The contributors address themselves to the responsibility of black political scientists to raise and clarify issues related to black survival and to the role of black scholars in the struggle for black liberation. Thus, while honoring Jewel Prestage for her works, these scholars wage battle against the ills of the political science discipline; the exploitation of blacks in America; and international oppression and thereby honor her more.

Finally, we thank the following publishers for granting permission to cite copyrighted material: The M.I.T. Press for Glazer and Moynihan's *Beyond the Melting Pot* and for Rainwater and Yancey's *The Moynihan Report and the Politics of Controversy*; Rutgers U. Press for Rivkin's *Nation-Building in Africa: Problems and Prospects*; Charles Scribner's Sons for Kelsey's *Racism and the Christian Understanding of Man*; and *Social Science Quarterly* for Jones and Willingham's "White custodians of the black experience."

SHELBY LEWIS SMITH
Atlanta, Georgia

Introduction: Essays In Honor Of A Black Scholar – Jewel Limar Prestage

Hanes Walton, Jr.

There is a rich tradition amongst academicians, intellectuals and scholars to honor their own through awards, plaques, certificates, dinners and collected essays. And the roots of some of these techniques extend back into the hellenistic age. However, in regards to the latter technique , collected essays, it has become more prevalent both in the twentieth century and in the area of the social sciences.

Collected Essays and Social Sciences

Recently, sociologists honored one of their¹ contemporary patron saints, C. Wright Mills¹, while historians continued their proud tradition by honoring scholars, in different sub-fields, such³as Southern History², Medieval History³, teaching History⁴, History⁴, and Literature⁵, the Crusades⁶, etc. In psychology, numerous essays have been penned in honor of Sigmund Freud, and social anthropologists have not forgotten Margaret Mead. Political scientists have likewise added to this rich tradition of issuing collected essays by honoring some of their founding fathers⁷, contemporary political philosophers⁸ and behavioral scholars like V. O. Key.

Nearly each area of social science has in one way or another - or through one technique or another - honored some of its outstanding contributors. And this tradition is not bound by countries or cultural ties. In short, scholars on a worldwide basis have participated in this long and honorable tradition.

Numerous things have triggered the occasion for the various techniques. In regards to collected essays, they have been written on birthdays, on retirement, on the passing or death of a scholar, after the achievement of significant recognition, on teaching anniversaries¹⁰, upon reaching a certain rank, etc. But no matter what the occasion or the event, almost all of the essays have been penned by students and admirers of the scholar. They have felt the influence of the giants and want others to do so in the future.

Publication of such essays are generally undertaken by the university and college libraries at which these men work - or at neighboring university presses produced through the auspices of the colleges in which these men work. And normally the essays cover the entire range of things, i.e., from an evaluation of the individual and his work, to his teaching ability, and to general essays in the field in which the scholar has worked. Lastly, almost all of the essays have attached a complete listing of the scholar's writings and works.

Black Scholars and the Tradition of Collected Essays.

However, the saddest and perhaps the least known part of this tradition of col-

lected essays is that it has overlooked black scholars. In the myriad and diverse archives of universities and colleges throughout the nation and the world, one is likely to seek in vain trying to find collected essays in honor of black intellectuals and academicians. This is not to say that blacks have not honored their own. For one only has to look at the limited number of black scholarly journals to read of dinners; in black newspapers and religious publications to see notices of such events to take place. Black scholars have honored their own, but on the whole this has been via techniques other than collected essays.

The basic reasons are indeed diverse. First, there have been "forces and personalities" in America and the world that insisted that blacks could never rise in the intellectual sphere¹¹. Secondly, since black scholarship is foundered in the rocks of racism and structured by principles of separation and segregation, the black scholar has become "the victim of segregation" in the cloistered walls of intellectual pursuit, "in the same way that blacks in other fields have become victims of segregation"¹². Therefore, unhappily black scholars had to face a situation, not entirely their own creation, in the perpetuation of which their state was very real indeed¹³. Hence, arose the field of black studies and in the field of American scholarship, it was all that they had. It grew in respectability not only because the impeccable scholarship of many blacks commanded it, but also because many of the whites conceded (and it was an unnecessary concession) that blacks had peculiar talents that fitted them to study themselves and their problems.

Black scholars had no "mystique", but were nevertheless drawn into black studies from the moment of their intellectual awakening to meet head on the assaults of those who would malign them and their race. And through their efforts, value and integrity of black studies were brought out. Soon recognized fields emerged: black history, black poetry, black sociology, black anthropology, black literature, etc.

Although not all black scholars chose to make their mark in black studies, some outstanding ones did. And their contributions in these areas have been unmeasurable, for the whole of mankind.

Yet, in his task, the black scholar must not only face lonely isolation in his search for the truth, he runs the risk of having his work rejected by those who frequently do not recognize him even if he maintains the universal standards developed to reach his conclusion. And finally he will be overlooked by the presses and libraries that will not carry his honor forward.

I must, however, pause at this point and say that John H. Clarke, editor of Freedomways, has devoted some issues to honor W. E. B. DuBois¹⁴ and Paul Robeson; and recently these have been published in book form. Other periodicals have devoted entire issues to some black scholars, but they have not found their way into print or book form. In short, the collected essay tradition for black scholars has been, indeed, limited, and honoring only those black scholars who have been social activists. Therefore, the path for the future is clear.

If whites and their publishers overlook black scholars and their contributions, and if black scholars have only limited exposure in the collected essay field, black scholars

must take it upon themselves to enlarge and enhance that tradition for their black intellectual pioneers must be rewarded and noted.

The purpose of the essays is clear. First, they seek to spread the ideas of individuals to future generations. Second, they seek to propagate a specific approach to scholarship, and finally they try to enhance a particular individual's statue in the future far beyond his day of influence. And in many cases these individuals and their ideas have been experimental to the black community and its scholarship. Hence, collected essays for black scholars stand as beacons against some of the vast darknesses that blacks are confronted with.

Jewel Prestage and Collected Essays

It is eminently fitting, therefore, and I deem it a signal honor and pleasure to collaborate with the eminent writers in this volume to pay tribute to one of the major pioneers in the field of black studies known as black politics. The idea of this commemorative volume in the honor of Prof. Jewel Prestage by her friends, students and well wishers is not only a signal that black scholars are taking the lead in furthering their own liberation (for Jewel Prestage's ideas are useful to all students of political science, especially blacks) but they are also committed to seeing that the influence she had on the development of this subject area shall not remain unknown to the future and present students of politics.

But beyond her ideas, influence and creative talents in helping black politics to evolve stand Jewel's efforts to make it grow with funds and assistance from foundations and the numerous political science profes-

sional associations. In other words, not only is she known as a scholar, but also as a mover, a doer, a maker, a shaper, and a sculptor of black political science, black political scientists, black political scientists professional organizations, and the art of black politics. She wrestled from white academicians the money, the recognition, the assistance and the aid needed to move black politics to a new level. She helped to remove the poverty of concern about black political scientists, their studies and plight from the white behaviorists of the 1960s and 1970s. She has combined theory and practice, concern and work, and idealism with realism. All of political science is much better because of her efforts. And it's in this light that the essays are written and published in her honor. All attest to her scholarship and practice and all reveal a common concern with some of the basic themes which have figured prominently in her activities. And these essays have taken the opportunity granted by this occasion to further explore in an independent fashion some of these themes. Each essay bears with varying degrees of directness upon the ideas and activities advanced by Prof. Prestage.

Almost immediately, the reader will notice that this volume does not express a single coherent argument and, therefore, that the essays which it contains are not intended to be read in sequence, but rather according to the mood and inclination of the reader. Coherence, the phantom we never really know, is put aside here for mood and temperament.

In conclusion, it is our hope that the essays collected here will throw further light upon certain central problems with which Prof. Prestage has been vitally concerned

throughout her academic and distinguished career, and that these essays be read in a truly critical fashion. For by paying critical attention to those problems with which Prof. Prestage wrestled, we will come closer to understanding why they have absorbed so much time and attention in the past. Lastly, the only fundamental tie that binds all of these essayists together is the shared interest in the work of Prof. Prestage, work they view from various perspectives but from which they have all learned much that is valuable.

Jewel Limar Prestage, I, as a black political scientist, salute you for the next black generation and mankind!

References Cited/Footnotes

- ¹C. William Domhoff and H. B. Ballard, C. Wright Mill and the Power Elite (Boston: Beacon Press, 1968).
- ²A. S. Link and Rembert Patrick, eds. Writing Southern History: Essay in Historiography in Honor of Fletcher M. Green (Baton Rouge: L.S.U. Press, 1967).
- ³James Cate and Eugene Anderson, eds., Medieval and Historiographical Essays in the Honor of James Westfall Thompson (N.Y., Kennikat Press, 1966).
- ⁴H. Stuart Hughes, ed., Teachers of History: Essays in Honor of Lawrence Bradford Pachard, (N.Y.: Cornell U. Press, 1954).
- ⁵Robert Bremmer, ed., Essays on History and Literature: For Foster Rhea Dulles (Columbus, Ohio State U. Press, 1966).
- ⁶Louis Paetow, ed., The Crusades and Other Historical Essays: Presented to Dana C. Munro by his former students. (N.Y.: Books for Libraries Press, Inc., 1968).

- 7 James Matthews and James Hart, eds. Essays in Political Science in Honor of Westel Woodbury Willoughby. (N.Y. Books for Libraries, 1968).
- 8 Preston King and B. C. Parekh, eds. Politics and Experience: Essays Presented to Prof. Michael Oakeshott on the Occasion of His Retirement, (Cambridge, Cambridge U. Press, 1968).
- 9 For an Asian scholar, see J. S. Bains, ed., Studies in Political Science: for Dr. C. J. Chacko (London: Asia Publishing Hse., 1961).
- 10 See C. H. Taylor, ed. Anniversary Essays in Medieval History for Charles Homer Hashins (N.Y.: Books for Libraries Press, 1967).
- 11 See John Hope Franklin, "The dilemma of the American Negro scholar" in Herbert Hill's Soon, One Morning (N.Y. Alfred A. Knopf, 1963, p. 65).
- 12 Ibid, p. 68
- 13 Ibid, p. 69
- 14 John H. Clarke, Black Titan (Boston: Beacon Press, 1971). See also Philip S. Foner W. E. B. Dubois Speaks (N.Y. Pathfinder Press, 1970).

Responsibility Of Black Political Scientists To The Black Community

Mack H. Jones

There is much discussion and an equal amount of confusion regarding the role and responsibility of academicians, including political scientists, to the larger black community. All kinds of theories are afloat, ranging from the profound to the profoundly inept. Indeed it is quite fashionable in some quarters to define the black community in a manner which summarily and categorically eliminates academicians and other professional blacks. This theory, which may be called the residual theory of the black community, limits membership to those brothers and sisters who bear the most severe brunt of economic exploitation - the laborer, the domestic, the underemployed urban proletariat, farm hand, and the lumpens. This definition of community, once it is given serious reflection, turns out to be a strange one indeed, for it makes membership in the black community contingent upon the level of economic exploitation one is forced to endure. Moreover, this definition makes a mockery of the struggles of those very persons whose economic plight it tends to romanticize. It says to those laborers and domestics (our parents) who struggled and

endured untold and unparalleled humiliations so that their progeny (you and me) could rise above the grinding poverty that was their lot that their efforts, their definite sacrifices served to weaken rather than strengthen the black community; for it says that when they succeeded in pushing their children above the more menial stations in life they also pushed them out of the community. And further, this residual definition of the black community renders those blacks with special training and skills alien among their brothers and sisters, aliens who can only aspire to a kind of associate membership to be earned by part-time missionary work.

Nevertheless, in spite of its obvious contradictions, there are many black professionals who have accepted this ill conceived definition of community. Many have accepted the notion that as academicians they are not bonafide members of the community, and like white liberals they have tried to justify their position by simple-minded romantic talk about, and fawning forays into, black proletarian neighborhoods. I, of course, reject this position out of hand and with maximum contempt. I find it much more useful to think of the community in comprehensive organic terms. As an organic entity, the black community comprises all persons of African heritage and all of the institutions which they form.

Through the dynamics of history every community develops a multitude of structures and functions which are essential to the survival of its members as a collectivity and various individuals and groups ultimately become responsible for carrying out these functions. For example, educational institutions, the church, business establishments, social welfare

bureaucracies, etc., all have specific responsibilities to the communities they serve; and of course so do the individuals who staff such institutions. This is no less true for academia and the academician, including the political scientist.

The confusion regarding the connectedness of the relationship between the academician and the black community is occasioned by the oppressed status of black people in America. In societies in which one group oppresses another, the oppressor or dominant group will always attempt to maintain its position of dominance and it will attempt to do so by structuring the institutions of the oppressed community, particularly schools and universities, such that they will serve the interest of the oppressor as opposed to those of their own communities. Thus, persons occupying positions in such black institutions are always faced with two opposite choices - performing their roles in conformity with the responsibilities entrusted them by the black community or bowing to the dirty worker dictates of the white community. When some black professionals accept the role of dirty worker we tend quite illogically to dismiss the entire profession as irrelevant or counter-revolutionary when the fact of the matter is that the role incumbent has simply abdicated on his responsibilities to the community.

Thus, instead of allowing ourselves to be read out of the black community and into the self-flagellating purgatory occupied by white liberals, it may be appropriate to ask ourselves what in general is the primary responsibility of academicians to their communities and in particular what are the primary responsibilities of black political

scientists, for our value and usefulness to the community will be determined by how well we perform our primary tasks and not in the quality of our paternalistic missionary forays into black proletariat neighborhoods.

What, then, are our primary responsibilities to our communities? We may begin to answer that question by looking at the function of institutions of higher learning in general. Such institutions across time and cultures have always had three distinct purposes: (1) reinforce the legitimacy of the prevailing order as defined by those of power and wealth, (2) predispose the subjects toward supportive behavior, and (3) prepare students to assume productive positions in the community within the constraints imposed by the prevailing regime. Those are the overriding purposes of higher education in every society - imparting to the students socially useful skills and a socio-political consciousness which will lead them to employ their acquired skills in a fashion consistent with the regime. For example, as I have written elsewhere, the ideal product of the South African university system would accept the legitimacy of apartheid and his Russian counterpart would show similar fealty toward scientific socialism. The Tanzanian student would accept the behavior code implied in the Arusha Declaration while the ideal American product would accept the constraints of capitalism grounded in white supremacy as legitimate².

Therefore, if this analysis has merit - and I am convinced that it does - American education and educators in general and as a consequence American political science and political scientists are essential cogs in the wheel of oppression, for they serve to legitimate its legal and philosophical foundations.

And any black academician or political scientist who sees himself as just another American as opposed to an African or black political scientist becomes a dirty worker and tool of his own oppression.

The responsibility of black political scientists is just the opposite of that of their white counterparts. While, as Morgenthau ~~has~~ deftly pointed out, American political scientists in general serve to camouflage the illegitimate exercise of power, we as black political scientists bear the responsibility of clearly and brutally unravelling the devious ways in which the American political system serves to exploit the many for the benefit of the few. Just as conventional American political science takes "maintaining a stable commonwealth" as a point of beginning, black political scientists must begin with the need to subvert that order. It is our responsibility to reinforce the legitimacy of the liberation struggle here and the struggles of other oppressed peoples throughout the world and to suggest viable models for that struggle and to give theoretical tools to those who would be cadres in the movement.

To meet these responsibilities we must first of all develop a political science which grows out of a black perspective; a black political science if you will. I am aware that there are those who have drunk too deeply from the polluted fountain of abstracted empiricism and become inebriated over the cause of scientific objectivity and are prepared to argue that there is no such thing as a black or white political science; that there is only pure, pristine, value-free political science. To those I am tempted simply to say you are drunk and it is not

my policy to argue with drunks no matter what the source of inebriation. However, since some might take such a reply as a cop-out or failure to deal with a legitimate and prickly issue, let me attempt to induce a bit of sobriety to such intellectual drunks by taking a brief journey through the philosophy of science. We may begin by affirming the obvious point that properly speaking all knowledge is unitary; every piece of knowledge, every fact has some relationship to every other piece of knowledge. It is only to facilitate orderly systematic inquiry that knowledge is compartmentalized and referred to as separate disciplines. The establishment of disciplines, of course, means deciding what facts from the universe of facts should be selected and aggregated for study. This then is a purposeful exercise; it is subjective and normative, the apologist of pure science notwithstanding. As Meehan has argued, knowledge serves two purposes: first the need to anticipate future events so that behavior can be adapted to them; and secondly, the need to control future events. Thus a claim to know is therefore nothing more than an assertion to the effect that a particular way of organizing human experiences is useful for a particular purpose.

The justification for a political science or any other intellectual enterprise moving from a black perspective, then, lies in the fact that both historically and contemporarily the conditions of blacks have been and continue to be significantly different from those of other groups and that consequently a political science which facilitates the anticipation and control function for blacks struggling for liberation must perforce be different from that which serves the broader white society.

To say that it must be different is not to say that it would be parochial, emotional, nor propagandistic as the drunk and naive detractors are wont to charge. It would be no less exhaustive than conventional "American" political science which, it must be noted, moves from the perspective of the dominant Anglo-Saxon community and is organized around the Anglo-Saxon vision of the optimum future circumstances under which mankind should live.

The black perspective then does not mean that students would know less about the world. But rather it means that the assumptions which determine what facts are deserving of attention and emphasis, which categories are useful, how facts are to be aggregated and what form analysis should take will grow out of the experiences of black people. To argue against the validity of such a perspective is to establish qualitative distinctions among the experiences of people and to suggest that only the Anglo-Saxon experience is of sufficient quality to give birth to paradigms for serious intellectual inquiry.

If the foregoing analysis adequately establishes the justification for, and the need to develop, a black political science we may conclude this discourse with a few random thoughts regarding the essential components of a black world view in which a black political science might be case. Such a world view would begin by recognizing that we, the black nation in the United States, are an African people. In would therefore look at our political predicament in an international context. This black world view would continue by recognizing the fact that at this juncture of history nowhere are African people truly independent. Everywhere -

North America, the Caribbean, on the continent - African people are dominated in varying degrees by people of European origin. The black world view must account for this. Is it a natural congenial condition of African people that they must be dominated by Europeans? Or is the present plight of African people a systemic condition of the present world order what is, of course, dominated by Western Capitalism led by the United States? If the plight of African people is systemic of the world order, then to what extent is the plight of the African peasant in Zibabwe, Chad, and the United States related? If their plights are interconnected then what does this interconnectedness portend for a black struggle in the United States which is designed to achieve equal opportunity for blacks within the context of the existing order? Would the success of such a struggle make us party to economic exploitation?

These, of course, are only a few of the concerns with which a black world view would deal. A political science growing out of such a context would put in sharp relief the self interests of blacks in America. The incompatibility of their interest - liberation - and that of American capitalism grounded in white supremacy would be obvious. From this new perspective a sustaining ideology would automatically flower, an ideology which would accentuate peoplehood among Africans throughout the diaspora. It would define both our friends and enemies and etch in the contours of the future we envision for our progeny.

It is our primary responsibility as black political scientists to begin. To be sure we have other responsibilities to our com-

munities. However, unless we first perform our primary task our other involvements run the risk of being counter-revolutionary anyway.

References Cited/Footnotes

- ¹For a further discussion of the dirty word syndrome, see my "The Kerner Commission: Errors and Omission", in Philip Meranto, ed., The Kerner Report Revisited, Univ. of Illinois Bull., June 1, 1970.
- ²Mack H. Jones, "The Responsibility of the Black College to the Black Community: Then and Now", Daedalus, Summer, 1971, pp. 732-744.
- ³Eugene Meehan, Explanation in Social Science, A System Paradigm (Homewood, ILL: Dorsey: 1968, pp. 18-21).

Black Independent Political Movements: Research Notes

Shelby L. Smith and Alex Willingham

The recent effort on the part of black people in the United States to define and develop an independent role in politics represents one of the truly innovative aspects in the recent history of the American political system. In a real sense, "politics" has come to occupy a place in the black community comparable to that held by civil rights agitation during the decade of the 1960s. It might be said that black people have indeed moved from "protest to politics" by taking extensive advantage of rights in the electoral arena which were first clarified - - and validated - - during the civil rights movement. This renewed emphasis on electoral politics suggests the need to develop criteria which will allow for an assessment of the precise role that this kind of civic effort will play in the continuing struggle by black people for political parity in North America.

Actually, the thrust of the new black politics has assumed several kinds of forms. At its least inspiring level it has simply been the continuation of white politics under a different color. There have been more meaningful variations though: In some cases it has simply been the demand that black people

be given an important nomination or two on the regular Democratic party ticket; in other cases it has assumed the form of a coalition of black Democrats and insurgent white allies organized against the regular Democratic party; among elected office holders we see similar kinds of movements as is evidenced by the black congressional caucus. Finally, in the last couple of years we have been hearing, again, calls for an all-black electoral instrument that would address itself - nationally - to the political needs of black people.

This new activity in the black community is of special importance to the student of politics and to the communities which are experiencing it for the first time. It will allow political scientists both to test the reliability of some central concepts which now form the basis of our efforts to explain politics while at the same time opening avenues for the discovery of new concepts which might be formalized in the future. Systematic analysis of these political actions in the black community can be expected to refine our knowledge about political behavior in general. On the other hand, those communities which are only now beginning to develop their political strengths will be able to make use of the tools of political science to assist them in analyzing strategies for political development and various of the competing criteria by which a given level of development may be judged successful or not. It is possible then to imagine a reciprocal relationship between the black academic political scientist working in this context and the various black communities which will be actually involved in these kinds of efforts.

Information about the actual workings of black political life is also badly needed for the teaching of black politics. The kind of information that is now used too often comes from the strained perspective of the dominant groups in the United States and seldom coincides with the reality of the black experience (our earliest efforts to correct this -- in the context of so-called black studies -- has been of limited success because of the need to establish an extensive theoretical and empirical base). In times past when black people seldom participated in electoral politics, this kind of emphasis was understandable. However, now that black people have assumed new roles in the electoral process new opportunities are open for comprehensive analytic studies as was not the case before. These kinds of studies can form the basis for pedagogical innovations which could substantially improve the quality of teaching.

We have noted that the compiling of this information would also be of use to the black community. It would provide avenues by which black students of politics would acquire first hand information on black politics. These students would, in turn, provide resources and expertise so as to analyze this information for comparative theoretical significance. Now this kind of activity would facilitate the development of resource persons whose knowledge would be utilized by communities interested in developing their own political strengths and learning about the kinds of things that have been tried in other communities. We feel it is vitally important to immediately initiate systematic studies of all recent innovations in black political life and especially the

efforts to develop independent black political instruments.

In the past it has too often been assumed that the black political patterns of the south would be just like those of the north. And, academic political science studies of black southern politics have often proceeded on the northern model even if it were not an explicit part of the analysis. There are a variety of intellectual implications of this which academics might characterize as "messy". It certainly is time that they be corrected. But the most dangerous failures result from the incorrect policy implications that may be drawn from the south in the face of a too liberal application of the northern model to southern conditions. It might be expected that the political culture, for example, of the urbanized northern black sector is different from that of the urban-rural counterpart. It is now necessary to make precise characterizations of these different cultures which get beyond the superficial and redundant concern with the attitudes of white folks in the two areas.

In the past the resources have been centered in the north and most of the studies have been done there. We think that it is now time to correct this historic imbalance and give detailed consideration to the black politics of the south. In this study we hope to contribute to this by devoting special time to a study of the Black Independent Political Movement in the southern states.

The methodology employed in this study would be varied and flexible enough to be adjusted as needed for operationalizing research plans. Generally the research approach would be divided into three broad categories

corresponding roughly to three phases of the study on Black Independent Political Movement: (1) case study, (2) empirical analysis, and (3) conceptualization or ideological theorizing.

Clearly an historical approach to the conceptualization and development of Black Independent Political Movements is necessary. The organization of the respective movements within the southern states involved a long and intricate process which must be viewed in the context of case history. An effort would be made to secure relevant data by, first, indepth interviews with key individuals within the movements, and next, by empirically surveying individuals who either observed or were involved in the creation of the movements. Media analysis, which could form a major portion of the historical data relative to the formation and activities of the movements, would constitute a third means of assembling data for the case study. Where possible, copies of taped interviews, press conferences, radio and TV broadcasts concerning the black movement would be critically analyzed as a means of ascertaining the role played by the media in the development of the movement. The researchers would travel to various sections of the country seeking sources of information relevant to the study, conducting interviews and attending ongoing meetings of black independent political groups.

The information collected for the case study would be codefied and analyzed for the purpose of testing various hypotheses regarding the nature and effect of black independent political movements. Such questions as, (1) what electoral and extra-electoral issues are

raised by the movement? (2) What are the directional voting patterns (uni- or multi-directional) of blacks? (3) What is the nature and size of the leadership groups? (4) Age and type of organization (hierachically) established would be examined in this phase of the study.

On the basis of the empirical data regarding the Southern Black Independent Political Movements of this era, historical knowledge of past activities and ideas, and leadership and mass black electoral and non-electoral trends as well as familiarity with black thinking over the past century (such authors as W. E. B. DuBois, Malcolm X, Franz Fanon, and Harold Cruse will form the theoretical backdrop for this phase of the study), the researchers intend to develop a rationale for independent black movements and to formulate an operational definition of the role of these movements in the struggle for liberation.

The Political Role Of The Stereotyped Image Of The Black Woman In America

Mac C. King

The position of the woman of an oppressed people has historically been a delicate and potentially strategic one for both the oppressors and the oppressed. In America, the physical access that some slave women had to the personal environment of the oppressors, demeaning though this status was, placed them in a position to carry on subversive activities geared to the liberation interest of their people¹. Conversely, this same situation made them vulnerable to being corrupted, i.e., identifying with or internalizing the values of the oppressors. If this occurred, the slave woman could become a valuable supportive instrument of the latter and thereby contribute to the perpetuation of the oppression of her own people. Hence, intrinsic in this position were the contradictory human possibilities of betrayal and devotion. The suspicion, guilt and degradation generated by such a predicament, gave birth to a legacy that uniquely burdens the black female in her relationship with males in American society. This legacy is manifested today in several stereotyped images and myths associated with black women. These female racial stereotypes appear to be indispensable to the maintenance

of the racially stratified order in America.

The purpose of this discourse is to explicate the stereotyped images of the black woman in the context of the American system and to look at the political implications of these images for the maintenance of power in a system based on racial determinism. This approach will also enable us to delineate the substantive differences between racial oppression, compounded by sex discrimination experienced by white women in American society. These two different phenomena must not be confused under the appellation of "women's liberation". To do so would be to equate historically structured legalized cruelty with selective socio-economic constraints. Furthermore, the assumption of such a position would tend to relieve the white female of any responsibility for the rôle that she plays, in partnership with the white male, in defending and perpetuating the system of racism in America.

The stereotyped images of the black woman discussed here are: The "non-feminist", the "depreciated sex object", and the "loser image". These stereotypes are in turn complemented by what appears to be an otherwise general policy of invisibility by the mass media with respect to black women. In our discussion, a stereotype refers to "an exaggerated belief associated with a category. Its function is to justify (rationalize) our conduct in relation to that category"². This definition points to the interrelatedness of stereotypes, images and myths. Furthermore, these function against the background of a racial caste system, and the latter will be thoroughly examined.

It should be noted at the outset that

a critical examination of the aforementioned images in the context of the American system should not be construed as an acceptance of the desirability of the values that the system assumes. Rather, an understanding and an appreciation of the systemic support provided by images that denigrate the black female necessitates analysis that assumes the role definition of the female in American society. Such role expectations constitute the basis for the creation of the images of the American woman (meaning white). These, as we will see, are in sharp contrast to those of the black female stereotypes. At this point, a look at the function of myths and images as control and influence agents of a political system, will help illuminate the significance of the black female stereotypes in the American order.

Every political system has its myths. Some are more dominant than others. These myths serve as a means of explaining and justifying the way of life of the society. Myths associated with racial identity are predominant in the United States and they have given birth to a caste system. "Caste, based on race, has been the dominant principle for organizing American society." A belief in the ideology of race provided the theoretical rationale for the caste organization. The caste system "is defended by a set of myths that are used to justify the restrictions, different levels of privilege, and practices of etiquette that separate the various groups from one another"³. The groups that concern us here, of course, are the blacks and the whites, and the image of the female both within and without each of these respective components of the caste system. It is our contention that the black female

stereotypes and their concomitant myths are indispensable to the maintenance of the caste system.

The political implications of the stereotyped images of the black woman cannot be fully understood without considering the role that racial caste has played in maintaining societal equilibrium in America. The term "equilibrium", according to Dorothy Emmet:

... Should only be used where it is possible to show that customs, institutions, and social activities related to them dovetail in together in certain specified ways so that one provides a corrective to disruptive tendencies in another.) It should also be possible to show how if these functional relationships are lacking, a form of social life will break down, and also how a reacting tendency may go too far⁴.

In this connection, the racial caste system defines the role (i.e., social activities) of black women as inferior to that of white women. This definition reflects the racist norms (i.e., customs) of America and the black female stereotypes are employed to help ensure mass conformity to these norms by all components of the caste system⁵. Families, schools, churches, corporations (i.e., institutions), have all institutionalized these norms. Exceptions notwithstanding, they have historically been, and still are, organized along racial lines with black institutions subordinate to white, with black roles subordinate to white ones, or in another sense, with white on top of black.

Utilizing Emmet as a frame of reference, then, if any one of these elements, i.e.,

customs, institutions, or social activities, become substantially disoriented from the racist norm, the entire American system, which is based on racial determinism is threatened. The equilibrium will be upset. In a current specific context, this is the meaning of the strong opposition to "forced busing" and forced "integration of the suburbs". This behavior is both predictable and "logical" within the context of the American system. For these slogans are simply code words signifying that these activities if taken beyond the token level are incongruent with the foundations of "racist democracy" (that is, one which applies the democratic principles on an interracial basis). Such activities may undermine the racist norms of the family and school environments. As a result, these two socializing agents, which have played crucial and indispensable roles in socializing white children to be racists⁶, would progressively loose their functional relationship to the American system. Should this happen, the racial form of social life in America would probably break down. This in turn might lead to new power arrangements that are hostile to the institutionalization of racist values.

→ Meanwhile, caste, as Gunnar Myrdal concludes, is the most accurate way of defining the position of blacks in America. [It is also the most accurate way of describing the distribution of power and resources in America.] While the techniques for maintaining this system have surely changed, the essence of the system, which is the collective subordination in terms of status and power of one racial group to another, remains intact.

According to G. S. Ghurge, the major features of the Indian caste system which is

considered the highest developed of such systems are as follows: (1) hierarchical order in which groups have a higher or lower status, (2) restrictions on marriage, (3) segmental division of society, (4) restrictions upon eating and other social intercourse, (5) civil and religious disabilities and privileges of different groups according to their caste status, and (6) lack of freedom in choosing an occupation .

Most of the above features are reflected in the American order. This system, which is also called color-caste, is defined by Floyd Warner as "a system of values and behavior which places all people who are thought to be white in a superior position and those who are thought to be black in an inferior status"⁹. It is in this sense that we use the term racial caste system.

It should be stressed that classes exist within both the upper and the lower caste, and in America, white males generally constitute the ruling class. They are the power-holders in the system. And the caste order that they control and serve has generated a variety of images and symbols depicting members of the lower caste, both male and female, as inferiors and underdesirables who, of course, are harmless as long as they "stay in their place". The use of the crucial function of simplifying and giving meaning to otherwise complex and conflicting observations and experiences. As a result, the metaphors, images, and myths, false though they may be, become central in determining political values, perceptions and attitudes¹⁰.

Against the background of racial castism in America the projection of negative black female stereotypes become inevitable. They

are indispensable to maintaining caste restrictions, especially those against inter-marriage between members of the upper and lower castes. At the same time, these negative images permit the imposition of intercaste sexual terror by male members of the upper caste. To reiterate, the stereotyped images most frequently portrayed of the black woman are those of the "non-feminist", which incorporates the matriarchy idea; the depreciated "sex object", and "the loser". In the absence of these negative visual presentations, American society has generally decreed the black woman invisible. Collectively, these images and the "invisible orientation" are calculated to deprive black women of their womanhood, self-respect and social status and hereby to dissuade any contemplation by members of the ruling class, of marriage with females of the lower caste.

Meanwhile, to destroy the risk of sex becoming a weapon used by female members of the lower caste as a means of weakening the power of the caste keepers, while males generally stripped sex between themselves and black females of any social significance and placed it exclusively in the realm of the biological. The political implications of this action must not be over-looked. For in a larger sense, the invention of the current stereotyped images of black women is but a continuation of the same cruel slave control method clothed in the garments of modern technology. Changing conditions demand new methods of control. At this point, a more specific examination of the nature of the black stereotypes is in order.

First, the non-feminist, depreciated

sex object, and loser images are in sharp contrast to those of the American woman (i. e., white). The latter is variously described as feminine, i.e., "small", "delicate", "soft" and "light". She may also be "dull, peaceful, relaxed, cold, rounded, passive and slow"¹¹. She is also portrayed as the ideal housewife and the symbol of love and motherhood. So much so that Alice B. Rossi has declared that "... for the first time in the history of any known society, motherhood has become a full-time occupation for adult women"¹². Such a reference, of course, obviously ignores the economic situation of black women.

Conversely, the "non-feminist" image connotes negative opposites. Black women are featured as tough, hard-working domestics who assume the role of matriarch in the home, but somehow always manage to know their place and remain appropriately submissive in the white world. Such an image permits the most, outrageous exploitation of black females as a cheap labor source. By "de-feminizing" them, America could subject them to the most harsh and unsafe working conditions without violating the white ethics that sustain the system.

Politically then, in addition to permitting exploitation of black female labor, the non-feminist image also allows continuous brutality and insults against the black woman without generating mass hostility which could lead to systemic disequilibrium. In the absence of such a threat, there is no compelling reason to rectify the inhumane conditions that support her abuse. It is most noteworthy, for example, that the United States congress was never moved to pass legislation

abolishing lynching when confronted with evidence showing how often black women fell victim to this American barbarity. Describing this situation, Maude White Katz states that from:

.... 1891-1921, the South lynched forty-five (the acknowledged number) Negro women, several of whom were young girls from fourteen to sixteen years old. One victim was in her eight month pregnancy. Members of the mob suspended her from the tree by her ankles. Gasoline was poured on her clothes and ignited. A chivalrous white man took his knife and split open her abdomen. The unborn child fell to the ground. A member of the mob crushed its head with his heel.¹³

Likewise, Walter White testified that:

"In 1918, a Negro woman about to give birth to a child was lynched with also unmentioned brutality along with ten men in Georgia. ¹ reached the scene shortly after the butchery and while excitement still ran high"¹⁴. Such atrocities, of course, did not engender corrective action by the white male power-holders because the social, political, and economic system that they guard excludes black women from its definition of womanhood, motherhood and femininity. Furthermore, the depravity of these power arrangements still prevail. And, acting out of this same tradition, white America made the Boston Strangler (to whom some white women fell victim) a household word, while in 1972 the brutal, patterned murder of six little black girls in the Washington, D. C. area and the systematic, mutilated slayings of five black women in Connecticut hardly received a foot-

note on national television.

Second, the image of depreciated sex object also serves a political function. Perhaps more than the non-feminist image, it excludes black females as potential marital partners of white males. In other words, it is a powerful psychological weapon which is designed to accomplish the same results as the historical use of physical brutality against black males accomplished in placing white females beyond their practical consideration as marital partners. Indeed, in the light of statistics on interracial marriage, one might speculate that the psychological weapon is more effective than the physical approach. In a deeper political sense, the depreciated sex image is intended to protect white males against momentary passion, compassion, or compunction that might result from their physical contact with black females. For such humane feelings sometimes lead to marriage which in turn entails partnerships, legal obligations, respect, dignity, and responsibilities. Marriage, then between members of the ruling class and those whom they oppress, inevitably undermines the rationale for the basis of oppression, whether the oppressive determinant be race, religion, culture or some other such factor. Hence, when stripped of its emotionalism, interracial marriage is a raw power question.

This point is reflected in a statement made by United States President Abraham Lincoln who has been erroneously labeled as the "Great Emancipator" of black people. In the famous Lincoln-Douglas debates, Lincoln asserted that:

... I will say then that I am not,

nor ever have been in favor of making voters or jurors of negroes, nor of qualifying them to hold public office, nor to intermarry with white people; and I will say in addition to this that there is a physical difference between the white and black races which I believe will forever forbid the two races living together on terms of social and political equality. And inasmuch as they cannot so live, while they do remain together, there must be the position of superior and inferior, and I as much as any other man am in favor of having the superior position assigned to the white race¹⁵.

Especially noteworthy is the linkage Lincoln makes between power that flows from officially sanctioned social rights, such as marriage, and those that emanate from the possession of political rights. Consequently, he infers that the power of the vote, the power to hold public office, and power of judicial judgement (i.e., the right to serve on juries) as well as interracial marriage are all equally as threatening to the superior power position which he chose to assign to the white race.

Historically, the political implications of marriage, i.e., its effect whether positive or negative, on power symbols (e.g., England's monarchy), or on the actual power arrangements, have been fully recognized. Subsequently, marriage has frequently been employed as a political weapon for securing property and power which otherwise would not be forthcoming. In feudal society, for example, marriages among the nobility were generally arranged to maintain or extend fiefs¹⁶. Frederick I of Germany, Holy Roman Emperor, attempted to

use marriage as a means of extending the power of his Kingdom. Therefore, after he was defeated in his attempt to conquer Italy by force, "he arranged a marriage between his son, the future Henry VI and Constance, heiress to the Kingdom of Sicily. He hoped that by surrounding Rome and Northern Italy with Hohenstaufen possessions, his son might succeed where he failed"¹⁷. This marriage in 1194 linked the Italian Kingdom with the German dynasty.

Ancient history offers memorable examples of how marriage was used to break, obtain, or consolidate power. The story of the biblical Jewish queen Esther is probably a familiar one. Esther, through the efforts of her uncle Mordecai, was brought to the palace of the King of Persia, Ahasuerus. The King loved her and made her queen. Meanwhile, Haman, Chief of the Prince of Persia and confidant of the King, considered the Jews a threat to the Kingdom because of their different customs and laws. With the initial consent of the King himself, Haman decreed that all Jews be destroyed. Upon hearing this decree, Esther petitioned the King to reverse it; pleading "for how can I endure to see the evil that shall come to my people? Or how can I endure to see the destruction of my own kindred?"¹⁸. Responding to her appeal, the King not only reversed the decree, he conceded to her wish to have Haman hanged along with his ten sons. Esther's uncle Mordecai was chosen to take over the position that was previously held by Haman. The King further granted the Jews the right to organize to defend themselves and "to destroy, to slay, and to cause to perish all the power of the people and the

province that would assault them, both little ones and women ..."¹⁹. The Jews proceeded to exercise the power that flowed from this grant. Politically, then, Esther used the influence derived from her queenly status to break the oppressive power that held the Jews in bondage.

One of the most celebrated ancient political romances is that of the black African queen, Cleopatra. Probably it is because of the political implications of her love affair with the Roman, Mark Anthony, that countries adhering to racism have insisted on painting her white. However, as John Clarke notes, "she was not a white woman. She was not a Greek ... Until the emergence of the doctrine of white superiority, Cleopatra was generally pictured as a distinctly African woman, dark in color"²⁰. Also Shakespeare refers to her as dark in color (tawny) in the opening paragraph of Anthony and Cleopatra.

This love affair between the representative of the Roman Empire and the Queen of Egypt, which was at the time a Roman protectorate, threatened the power of the Empire. Denouncing the bond between Anthony and Cleopatra, Octavius Ceasar informed his sister (Anthony's wife by Roman law) that Cleopatra had won the heart of Anthony and that "... He hath given his empire up to a whore, who now are levying the Kings o'th earth for war"²¹. Nevertheless, Octavius' anger notwithstanding, the fact is that Cleopatra, like Esther, used the influence derived from her personal relationship with a ruler, and previously with Julius Ceasar himself, to protect her people and the interest of Egypt. Describing this situation, Clarke

states that Cleopatra, who was born in 69 B.C. ... Came to the throne that she shared with her brother Ptolemy XII, when she was 18 years old. Egypt, now a Roman protectorate was beset with internal strife and intrigue. Cleopatra aligned herself with Julius Ceasar who reinforced her power. Their political and sexual relationship was a maneuver to save Egypt from the worst aspects of Roman domination. After Julius Caesar was murdered, Cleopatra still in her early twenties, met Mark Anthony and a love affair strongly motivated by politics began.

Her effect on Mark Anthony was profound. This noble Roman turned traitor to his own people when he attempted to save the country of this fascinating black queen from Roman domination. After Anthony's death, the victor, Octavius, assumed full control of Egypt and Cleopatra now without a protector or companion, committed suicide²².

Hence, history is a constant reminder of how sexual bonds between man and woman, based on mutual respect and dignity, tend to transcend otherwise divisive forces. Moreover, they have led to the undermining of the status quo that sustain power arrangements, including those that are oppressive.

Third, the loser image is not without its political function. It aims to stifle or destroy the very self-esteem, respect and aspirations of the black woman. This image is activated whenever the black woman attempts to "move out of her place". In other words, whenever she competes for a position or status, whether social or

economic, that is generally identified with whites, especially white women, she is featured as a failure. A reference to the images of the black woman projected by one or two motion pictures will suffice to demonstrate this repeated occurrence. Indeed, the daily experiences of those who care to observe will probably testify to this point. For example, as long as the black woman remains a domestic, America's media portrays her as a happy figure, scattered brain perhaps, but happy. This was true of Butterfly McQueen who played servant to "Miz Scawlett" in "Gone With the Wind", and also of Hattie McDaniels who performed the same function for "Miz Alice" in the radio-television "Beulah" series. On the other hand, Diana Sands in the movie "Georgia, Georgia", becomes a tragic figure and her romance with a white man predictably leads to a tragic end. This same scene is repeated in the "Omega Man". While "For Love of Ivy" portrays a black woman succeeding in her love affair with Sidney Poitier, Abbey Lincoln, to be sure, is featured as a maid to a white suburban family. Deviations from depictions of this type relating to the black woman are rare exceptions indeed.

The loser image is directed at imposing and reinforcing a frame of reference for black females which psychologically and socially contrains. Simultaneously, it intimidates her with the penalty of pain by depicting tragic experiences for those of her kind who dare venture beyond the boundaries of the constricted roles of members of a lower caste. At the same time, this image is calculated to deprive her of the will to fight back. For the environ-

ment in which it is projected is populated by beings who have been socialized to treat her as a thing not of value. Consequently, rejection of her presence, and violations and abuses of her person become rather routine responses of these inhabitants. Assuming the validity of this assertion, the loser image is one that white America finds congenial to its own way of life. Furthermore, the constraining effect of this image will most likely militate against black women enjoying any substantial benefits that might result from a societal redefinition of the role of "women".

At this point, it is appropriate to stress the intercaste nature of the "women's liberation movement". For it is this distinguishing aspect that dictates the incidental character of benefits that might seep through to black women as a result of an intracaste sex battle at the upper power level. However, this should by no means be interpreted to suggest that sex discrimination does not exist within the lower caste, it does; or that the white male castees do not extend their multi-clawed tentacles beyond caste boundaries to duplicate in a brutal fashion their sexist tradition, they do. Rather, the point is that until racial castism is abolished in America, no coalition between disadvantaged groups of whites and racially defined, exploited and oppressed blacks will be sufficient to liberate the black element of the coalition. This is true because the white male powerholders, in accordance with their power maintenance interests, will offer to reward the white element of the coalition. In so doing, they simultaneously neutralize the latter's oppo-

sition and activate their racism. As a result, the movement turns conservative, i. e., racist.

This was true of the Woman Suffrage Movement. This fact is substantiated in a 1903 statement by the national board of directors of the National American Women Suffrage Movement. The statement was a response to an accusation by the news media that the women were going soft on racism. In an attempt to disassociate themselves from what they apparently viewed as un-American behavior, the women declared:

... Like every other national association (we are) made up of persons of all shades of opinion on the race question and on all other questions except those relating to its particular object. The northern and western members hold views that are customary in their sections. The southern members hold views that are customary in the south. The doctrine of states rights is recognized ... The National American Woman Suffrage Association is seeking to do away with the requirement of a sex qualification for suffrage. What other qualifications will be²³asked for, it leaves to other states²³.

Black women of the 1970s still burdened by the system-sanctioned stereotypes, would be politically naive to discount the decisive role that racism will most likely play in decision-making in the women's movement. There is reason to believe that white women in the 1970s, like those of an earlier period, will disassociate themselves from the issue of racial justice whenever it appears advan-

tageous for them to do so. Furthermore, there is a fundamental difference between their concerns and problems and those of black women. This difference is derived from the racial caste nature of the American system itself. This fact dictates different problem-solving approaches and programs of action which may be incompatible. In any case, since the system favors white over black, including white women over black women, it is not likely that the former will voluntarily seek to dismantle that which serves their interests and pamper them with privileges. Yet, the problems of black women will defy solution as long as America retains racial castism. Therefore, black women must air for the abolition of the racial caste foundation of the American State itself.

In conclusion, it should be emphasized that although the stereotyped images of black women are devoid of reality, this actuality hardly diminishes their effectiveness in achieving the political and power purposes that they serve. The power of image-making is concentrated in hands of white male castees and, therefore, their victims have little recourse to counteracting the negativisms that derive from this situation. As long as the power relations that sustain this monopoly persist, the reality of the black woman's plight in America will continue to be distorted and suppressed.

Finally, in explicating the stereotyped images of black women, we have shown that these images are basic and functional to a political system founded on racial oppression and organized on the caste principle. In America, they serve ultimately as a means of institutionalizing the "power

distance" between the white male power-holders and the lower caste victims of their action. Since the stereotypes symbolize system-sanctioned degradation, the powerholders are, not only free to, but encouraged to exploit the black woman on an economic, personal and social basis without incurring cost to their power position, status, conscience, or material well-being. Moreover, although modernized racism theoretically accords legal status to intercaste marital relationships, the negative stereotypes not only limit these to an almost infinitesimal number, but also strip them of political significance. In so doing, they eliminate any potential threat that such relationships may pose to the status quo power arrangements of the American system.

References Cited/Footnotes

¹For a detailed discussion of this point, see Angela Davis', "Reflections on the Black Woman's Role in the Community of Slaves", The Black Scholar, Dec., 1971.

²Gordon W. Allport, The Nature of Prejudice (N.Y.: Doubleday, 1958, p. 187).

³Liston Pope, The Kingdom Beyond Caste (N.Y.: Friendship Press, 1957, p. 53. See his Chapter 4 for a discussion of the variability of caste and the inconsistency of caste rulers. The latter point is especially pertinent to the American situation).

⁴Dorothy Emmet, Function, Purpose and Powers (London: MacMillan, 1958, p. 74).

⁵This point will become more evident later when we consider the basic features of a caste system.

- ⁶Most political socialization studies implicitly ascribe this function to the family and school without specifying the implications of this position. Such studies show how both of these crucial agents of socialization are overwhelmingly supportive rather than disruptive of the American political system. See, for example, Fred Greenstein, Children and Politics, and Kenneth P. Langton, Political Socialization.
- ⁷See Gunnar Myrdal, American Dilemma (N.Y.: Harper & Row, 1944, Vol. 1, pp. 667-668.).
- ⁸Cited by E. Franklin Frazier, Race and Culture Contacts in the Modern World (Boston: Beacon Press, 1957, p. 254).
- ⁹W. Lloyd Warner, Social Class in America (N.Y.: Harper & Row, 1949, p. 268).
- ¹⁰Murray Edelman, Politics as Symbolic Action (N.Y.: Markham Publ. Co., 1971, Chap. 5).
- ¹¹Robert J. Lifton, ed., The Woman in America (Cambridge: Houghton, Mifflin Co., 1965, p. 173. For further discussion of these stereotypes, see Nancy Reeves, Womankind: Beyond the Stereotypes, 1971).
- ¹²Cited in Lifton, op. cit., p. 106.
- ¹³Maude White Katz, "The Negro Woman and the Law", Freedomways, Vol. II, No. 3, p. 289.
- ¹⁴Walter White, "I Investigate Lynchings", IN: Black on Black, edited by Arnold Adoff (N.Y.: MacMillan, 1968, p. 36).
- ¹⁵Quoted by Thomas F. Gossett, Race: The History of an Idea in America (N.Y.: Schocken Books, 1965, p. 254).
- ¹⁶Carlton J. H. Haynes et al., History of Europe (N.Y.: MacMillan, 1949, p. 167).

¹⁷Ibid, p. 281.

¹⁸Esther, 8:6

¹⁹Esther, 8:11

²⁰John Henrik Clarke, "The Black Woman: A Figure in World History", Essence, May, 1971, p. 39.

²¹The Tragedies of William Shakespeare, Peter Alexander, editor (N.Y.: Heritage Press, 1958, p. 1021).

²²Clarke, op cit., p. 29.

²³Quoted by Catherine Stimpson, "Women's Liberation and Black Civil Rights", IN: Vivian Gornick and Barbara K. Moran, editors, Women in Sexist Society (N.Y.: New American Library, 1972, p. 643).

Racism and Sexism: A Double Tragedy Issuing From A Single Source¹

Samuel DuBois Cook

The tragedy of racism and sexism is a grim reminder of the indivisibility of justice and the ultimate solidarity of the human family. In the final calculus of human existence, whatever preserves and promotes justice is an agency of the common good or public interest. Justice unites. Justice advances and conserves the best of human community.

From my angle of vision, both racism and sexism are terrible evils, both are morally and rationally indefensible, both disturb the harmony of creation, and both are destructive of much that is precious in human life, thought, and experience. To be sure, much depends upon definition, criteria, institutional manifestation, and evaluation, but, within my structure of meaning and

¹In her personal and professional life, Dr. Jewel Prestage is a vigorous and implacable foe of both racism and sexism. In participating in an enterprise to honor her, I do honor to myself. The totality of her life and commitment dictates the subject matter of this brief essay.

universe of understanding, racism and sexism are brutish, irrational, and arbitrary means of giving preference to some human life over other human life. Both deny the fundamental equality of human rights. Racism and sexism alike are a function and consequence of collective arrogance, pride, egoism, and self-worship.

Racism and sexism are based on a priori principles of exclusion and inequality. Their ultimate philosophic ground is that of the bifurcation of human existence at the primordial level. Differences of color and sex are read back into the constitution of reality, the very texture of being itself. Racism and sexism, in the final analysis, are ontological affirmations and predicates. Intellectual, social, vocational and moral differences are read back into the order of creation involving sex and color. A biological fact is made decisive in the determination of the totality of life and culture. Historical inequalities and disabilities are explained and justified in terms of a purely biological premise. Basic human equality is denied because of a purely physical fact. Human life, therefore, is divided into superior and inferior, domination and subordination, ruler and ruled, ends and means. In racism and sexism, a form of particularity is conceived in terms that justify white supremacy and male supremacy, white and male superiority and black and female inferiority. Both perspectives involve contempt for human life. Both make one form of human life primordial and another derivative, one dominant and the other subordinate. Both are contemptuous of human equality. In racism and sexism, there is the tragic paradox of some

human beings finding meaning in the de-meaning of other human beings.

"Racism", said George Kelsey, "is a search of meaning. The devotee of the racist faith is as certainly seeking self-identity in his acts of self-exaltation and his self-deifying pronouncements as he is seeking to nullify the selfhood of members of the out-races by acts of deprivation and words of vilification"¹. Racism and sexism are transcendent forms of human alienation, estrangement, and separation.

As Kelsey asserted, racism is a faith... which makes it the final and complete form of human alienation. Racism is human alienation purely and simply; it is the prototype of all human alienation. It is the one form of human conflict that divides human beings as human beings. That which the racist glorifies in himself is his being. And that which he scorns and rejects in members of out-races is precisely their human being. Although the racist line of demarcation and hostility inevitably finds expression through the institutions of society, it is not primarily a cultural, political, or economic boundary. Rather, it is a boundary of estrangement in the order of human being as such.²

Racism is a philosophy of history, a doctrine of man, a philosophy of values and culture, a moral and religious system, and an ontological affirmation. The ultimate evil of racism is that it makes white life precious and sacred and black life cheap and profane. Whereas racism destroys the humanity of its victims, sexism limits, defiles, distorts, and perverts the humanity

of its victims. In racism, white life is made an end in itself; black life is made a means. In sexism, male life is made an end in itself; female life is reduced to that of a means.

Human nature is a peculiar phenomenon. It has to have ideological sanctions and intellectual justifications, at least to itself, of its patterns of behavior and choices, even for its wretched evils and wicked acts. Evil has to be made to appear good, and wrong right, and the unjust just.

Hence racism and sexism have sought justification in God, custom, tradition, justice, order, and the common good. Above all, the natural order has been invoked as a sanction: they are ordained of nature and vital part of the natural order of things and existence. Thus sexism and racism have sought built-in justifications, impregnable sanctions. "But", said John Stuart Mill, "was there ever any domination which did not appear natural to those who possess it?"³. I am reminded of a great observation by Walter Rauschenbuch: "... the idealization of evil is an indispensable means for its perpetuation and transmission"⁴. Racism and sexism are guilty of radical self-deception in the giant moral pretension that their unjust arrangement is good for the victims as well as for their perpetrators.

Racism and sexism are common forms of collective pride, self-worship, egotism, and moral pretensions, arrogance, and conceit. Reinhold Niebuhr said that racism is a form of original sin. And so is sexism. Both falsify life. "There is nothing", said John Stuart Mill, "which men so easily learn as this self-worship: all privileged persons,

and all privileged classes, have had it"⁵.

Sexism and racism are also forms and affairs of power and control, systems of domination. Power is at the heart of both philosophies and practices. They are means whereby some life dominates and controls other life. Racism and sexism without power are contradictions in terms. They are indeed philosophies of power and domination. And the power relationships inherent in racism and sexism are unjust and oppressive. Both are expressions of the perennial tyranny of power. "Justice", said Paul Tillich, "is the form in which the power of being actualizes itself A wrong, unjust power relation may destroy life"⁶. The common power assumption is that of command and obedience. Racism assumes that whites are born to command and blacks are born to obey. Sexism asserts that men are born to command, and women are born to obey. Both affirmations are rooted in the assumption that the position of power is derived from and is a function of birth.

But sexism and racism seek to camouflage their will-to-power and domination by sentimentality and moral sanction. Thus,

Men do not want solely the obedience of women, they want their sentiments. All men, except the most brutish, desire to have, in the woman most nearly connected with them, not a forced slave but a willing one, not a slave merely, but a favourite. They have therefore put everything in practice to enslave their minds.

Which introduces the issue of socialization to hide the brute and stubborn realities of power. In the very definition and conception of self, character, role, and nature, the victims of sexism and racism are educa-

ted to cooperate, accept their lot with dignity and pride, and believe the myth that the system of oppression and exploitation represents their choice, will, and best interest. Thus, according to Mill:

—The masters of women wanted more than simple obedience, and they turned the whole force of education to effect their purpose. All women are brought up from the very earliest years in the belief that their ideal of character is the very opposite to that of men; not self-will, and government by self-control, but submission, and yielding to the control of others. All the moralities tell them that it is the duty of women, and all the current sentimentalities that it is their nature, to live for others; to have no life but in their affections. And by their affections are meant the only ones they are allowed to have -- those to the men with whom they are connected, or to the children who constitute an additional and indefeasible tie between them and a man.

John Stuart Mill died in May of 1873. Although separated by more than a century, Kate Millett, in Sexual Politics, makes a similar observation about the socialization of women to a role of inferiority.

Sexual politics obtains consent through the 'socialization' of both sexes to basic patriarchal politics with regard to temperament, role, and status. As to status, a pervasive assent to the prejudice of male superiority guarantees superior status in the male, inferior in the female. The first item, temperament, involves the formation of human personality along stereotyped lines of sex

category ('masculine' and 'feminine'), based on the needs and values of the dominant group and dictated by what its members cherish in themselves and find convenient in subordinates: aggression, intelligence, force, and efficacy in the males; passivity, ignorance, docility, 'virtue', and ineffectuality in the female.... The limited role allotted the female tends to arrest her at the level of biological experience. Therefore, nearly all that can be described as distinctly human rather than animal activity (in their own way animals also give birth and care for their young) is largely reserved for the male.

Thus, racism and sexism do, in large measure, have a common philosophic origin, justification, and institutionalization. Their social consequences, too, are very akin: oppression, depersonalization, dehumanization, the radical denial of their full stature as whole persons, a corruption of their best selves, and deprivation of the full dimensions of selfhood. There is something of a common phenomenology. The problems are intertwined; the struggle for liberation are interrelated. Both systems of meaning and value represent caste. Gloria Steinem asserted:

In this society characteristics attributed to women can also be attributed to non-white men. We are childlike, have smaller brains, are incapable of governing ourselves, can't be involved in grown-up (white male) affairs, are emotional and always late, have special job skills

that are always poorly paid, are more sexual and have natural thym. According to television, we even had peculiar odors¹⁰.

And both racism and sexism are rooted in force, the rule of the strong, the right of might.

I am not asserting that there are no differences between men and women. I am maintaining that, (1) the differences are essentially biological and should enrich rather than improvish human life. They add the richness and vitality of diversity and the ethic of completion and mutuality. (2) The biological differences are irrelevant to problems of intellectual talent, vocational interests, cultural participation, in brief, to the issues of citizenship and a common humanity. (3) The differences between male and female pale into insignificance beside the similarities. (4) The non-biological differences which have expressed themselves in terms of so many disabilities for women have been determined and enforced by men. This is a reflection of, among other things, collective self-worship, the arrogance of power, and moral conceit.

The black revolution has, no doubt, informed and inspired much of the women's liberation movement. One wonders about the possibility and desirability of a genuine coalition or alliance between the opponents of sexism and racism.

Sexism and racism cannot be squared with the promises of land. They cannot be made consistent with democracy, reason, and human decency. Both are terrible evils. As George Kelsey asserted: "The logic of racism is genocide"¹¹. The logic of sexism is not genocide but dehumanization, arrested

growth and development, a stunted existence, a tragic waste of human talent.

Let me end with a quotation from Mill:

The morality of the first ages rested on the obligation to submit to power; that of the ages next following, on the right of the weak to the forbearance and protection of the strong. How much longer is one form of society and life to content itself with the morality made for another? We have had the morality of submission, the time is now come for the morality of justice¹²;

References Cited/Footnotes

¹George D. Kelsey, Racism and the Christian Understanding of Man (New York, 1965, p. 23).

²Ibid.

³John Stuart Mill, On the Subjection of Women, a Fawcett Premier book, with an introduction by Susan Brownmiller (Greenwich, 1971, -. 27)

⁴Walter Rauschenbusch, A Theology for the Social Gospel (New York, 1971, p. 66).

⁵Mill, op cit., p. 61.

⁶Love, Power and Justice, Galaxy edition (New York, 1960, p. 56).

⁷Mill, p. 30.

⁸Ibid, pp. 30-31.

⁹Sexual Politics, (N.Y.: Avon Books, 1969, p. 26).

¹⁰Priscilla Nieves, "Feminist Raps 'Caste System'", Durham Morning Herald, April 11, 1973, p. B1.

¹¹Kelsey, op cit., p. 96.

¹²Mill, p. 62.

A Question Of Authority

William Jefferson

"The most deadly of all possible sins", Erik Erikson has observed, "is the mutilation of a child's spirit"¹. And the most damning mutilation of spirit, he could have added, is the stifling of a child's sense of self - - self importance and self ambition.

The thought itself is horrible, let alone the deed. It bespeaks a contempt for and lack of civility toward children that belongs to earlier, less enlightened times. But these horrors, these mutilations are occurring today. They are occurring daily in American public schools, primarily in the south.

In a broadside attack on public education in this country, Lillian Smith refers to public schools as those "killers of dream"². But present day events are giving her cryptic phrase new meaning, meaning that she did not contemplate.

The current perpetrators of these sins had considerable experience. In the days of Jim Crow, it was local white public school officials in the south who implemented and monitored the operations of racially segregated public education. They made the decision to buy more textbooks and desks, and better buses and gymnasiums for white

schools. And they decided, at the local level, to place more lights and plan more trees on white school grounds. Yet, despite those important decisions, these officials were distant, almost invisible figures to black students.

Of course, black children knew that their black principals and teachers had white bosses, but these whites were not present in the schools and had no direct hand in the things that happened to these children during a school day. Black principals and teachers controlled class schedules, discipline and the honor roll, and decided which students played sports or were cast in school plays.

Today, almost all of this has changed. The combined forces of law and politics have catapulted black students and teachers into an alien and sometimes conflict-filled arena - - the desegregated public school. Ironically, the massive desegregation of public schools has had a deleterious effect on the capacity of these schools to focus on delivering a "quality" education to public school students, which, of course, is suppose to be the whole point of intergration. "Side issues" such as enforcing dress and conduct codes, monitoring "social contacts" between students, and general "discipline" are distracting from achieving that goal. This emphasis is discouraging and frustrating students. Some are turning off, and too many are turning on to hostility, violence and trouble. Many are saying they want to return to all-black schools. To them, what black schools lacked in prestige, funding and atmosphere, they appear to have more than made up for in serenity and sin-

cerity.

But the most egregious mutilations of these children are "indirect". These "indirect" actions are primarily discriminatory practices taken by local school officials against black educators. Whenever schools are integrated, school officials move to limit or eliminate the presence or effectiveness of black administrators and teachers within the integrated school.

While white students are steadily fleeing public schools in the south, white principals and teachers are increasing their numbers, displacing black staffers who are being heavily dismissed, demoted and passed over for hire.

The Louisiana situation is illustrative:

1. From 1965 through 1968, white and black public school enrollment increased. White teachers were hired in proportion to increased white student enrollment and black teachers were hired in proportion to increased black student enrollment.

2. At the beginning of the 1969-1970 school year, however, when most Louisiana school districts were under court order to desegregate, white student enrollment declined significantly, but without a corresponding decline in the number of white teachers hired. In fact, the hiring of white teachers accelerated. Conversely, while black student enrollment during the same time period increased, the number of black teachers employed in the public schools declined.

3. In the 1970-1971 school year, the teaching force declined by 1,003 with a further decrease in white student enrollment. Notwithstanding a decrease in the number of white teachers employed, the

percentage of whites in the total teaching force rose from 65.9% to 66.3%. Meanwhile, black student enrollment increased, while the number of black teachers declined.

4. In 1971-1972, the percentage of black teachers in the total force dropped still further (from 33.7% to 32.2%) despite the fact that black student enrollment increased (from 40.5% to 43.2%).

5. The number of black principals peaked in 1966 at 512. Four years later, only 413 black principals remained. However, 69 white principals were added during this period.

6. In 1970, the already high displacement rate accelerated as an additional 48 black principals lost their jobs. During that same period the number of white principals increased by 43.

7. By the 1971-1972 school year, 13 more white principals were added while the number of black principals declined by nine.³

What is the point of this? Racism? To be sure. But this merely states the conclusion. It does not explain the problem, nor does it tell us why that conclusion is correct.

The point is that whites want to assume authority over every desegregated school. Since authority commands obedience, the real question is who controls and who obeys. This is a political question in origin and nature.

The establishment of proper authoritarian models is crucial to an "impressionable" young child's proper view of himself. The assumption of authority over public schools by whites, a dangerous model in itself, is even more harmful when it is achieved by or is used to downgrade and fire black educators.

And when these apparently mistreated blacks are without legal or political recourse, then the worst of all possible models is established for both black and white students⁴.

If these models are allowed to be built upon - - reinforced and perpetuated - - the real danger exists that the supposed legal and political gains made by blacks over the last decade will be lost or their value minimized for future generations. The letter of newly acquired laws will probably not change, but the political relationship, the ability of whites to influence and define the conduct and the sense of self of young blacks may be more destructively reimposed in the sensitive context of the public school house.

This fiction for faculty intergration has received considerable political-legal support. Riding the high sounding slogans of "new federalism" and "local control", the federal administration has effectively abandoned black teachers. "New federalism" is a euphemism for "state's rights"; it is "state's rights" upside down, but it carries the same implications for blacks. For black teachers it means that federal anti-discrimination laws in this area will not be enforced. It is an apparent acknowledgment that the displacement of black educators is "justified" and will not be interfered with. This "hands-off" policy signals to local school districts that black displacement will not result in the imposition of sanctions and, thereby, exacerbates the displacement problem.

The courts are essentially taking the same line. They require an initial mix of black to white faculty at the outset of the

desegregation process. But once this initial adjustment is accomplished, the system is labeled "unitary", and the courts then leave it to school boards to establish criteria for the future hiring and retention of teachers; courts are dropping all responsibility for judicial monitoring of the "unitary" school to insure that old practices are not re-established. Given this wide latitude to discriminate, the figures show that black educator displacement is steadily rising after courts withdraw and that hiring is at a virtual standstill.

This political and legal "support" is coming from sources to which blacks have looked to in the past for protection. But despite this support, public school faculty "intergration" has achieved the normalcy it needs to do its most effective damage. Obviously, white school officials are in the driver's seat, but the apparent power they have over black educators and teachers is being vigorously tested.

The problem these officials are up against is that the "authority" they suppose they have is not real authority. It is propped up authority. More analytically, the "authority" they have assumed is illegitimate; it is what Hannah Arendt has described as "authority in general", as opposed to a specific, hierarchial authoritarian order. According to Arendt, authority means something different from either the power to coerce by force or power to persuade through arguments. "The authoritarian relation between the one who commands and the one who obeys rests neither on common reason nor on the power of the one who commands; what they have in common is the hierarchy, itself, whose rightness and

legitimacy both recognize and where both have a predetermined stable place"⁵.

This is the heart of the problem. In the educator displacement situation, there is no agreement, no recognition of the right of whites to occupy their present positions nor to exercise control. In fact there is a great body of law and factual evidence which argues strongly against the legitimacy of a white take-over of public schools. That is why control, such as it is, is being exercised through coercive measures and why the order remains dynamic.

How then is this rightness, this legitimacy to be achieved? Again, Arendt provides a partial answer: "The difference between tyranny and authoritarian government has always been that the tyrant rules in accordance with his own will and interest, whereas even the most draconic authoritarian government is bound by laws. Its acts are tested by a code which was ... not made by those actually in power. The source of authority in authoritarian government is always a force external and superior to its own power; it is always this source, this external force which transcends the political realm, from which the authorities derive their 'authority', that is, their legitimacy, and against which their power can be checked"⁶.

Taking this view, the first step toward legitimacy is for courts or legislatures to restrict the ability of school districts to formulate their own standards for dealing with educators, particularly black educators. The current vague judicial standards requiring only that school districts formulate and apply "reasonable", "objective" and "nondiscriminatory" criteria gives too

much discretion to the individual school district. Litigation has revealed that school districts do not always formulate such criteria, and that where they do, they often include subjective standards which afford school districts latitude to discriminate.

Secondly, the merit issue must be reviewed. There must be official recognition that the operative rule for school boards is not that black educators are in general, despite background and experience, less qualified and less competent than whites to teach in or to administer a desegregated school. Indeed, the argument can be forcibly made that a more or less stable ratio of black to white teachers should be mandatorily present in the school system and that this is itself a merit standard. The theory is that, although race is usually a "non-merit" criterion in the staff employment context, it may be a criterion going to "merit" in the present southern public school intergration context in that it is related to employment productivity; or negatively put, the absence of meaningful black representation on the teaching and administrative level and the means through which that absence is maintained is retarding the educational and social development of public school students

This is an old fashioned view of authority, as even Hannah Arendt concedes. But it is nonetheless valid. Many of today's public schools in the south are political battlefields where political power is struggled for. Having been forced to abandon the political right to maintain segregated institutions, public school officials are rebounding from this "defeat" by re-establishing themselves to their

former political places. But this takeover does not have the support of the external, legitimating forces that existed before the recent political shake-up, and in many cases runs directly afoul of the existing external forces of law. So these political battles continue, mutilating children everyday and in the most severe ways. Public school officials are facing a crisis, but it's not a crisis of discipline or of power, as is the popular thinking; rather, it is a crisis of authority.

Therefore, present "authority" must be legitimated by imposing an order that has the recognized "rightness" to enable integrated public schools to fulfill their high purpose and promise.

References Cited/Footnotes

¹Silberman, Crisis in the Classroom Report (1970); reprinted in "Mindlessness", Idea Reporter, p. 1, Summer Quart., 1970.

²Id.

³Jefferson, "School Desegregation and the Black Teacher: A search for effective remedies", 48 T.L. Rev., No. 1 at 55, 57-58.

⁴... Black children, by seeing black teachers and administrators down-graded or fired, are impressed with the feeling that blackness is a mark of inferiority. Their reaction in many cases is one of self hate, although in recent years this has been replaced by feelings of rebellion... White children, on the other hand, are led to believe that their whiteness makes them superior persons. This condition perpetuates the thoroughly discredited myth of white superiority, and

inhibits their future adult life, making it difficult for them to operate effectively in a multi-racial world. Excerpt from statement of George Fisher, President of NEA. See Hearings before the Senate Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity, 91st Congress, 2nd Session, pt. 10 at 1078.

The Works And Experiences of Daniel P. Moynihan: A Rationale For Black Genocide And A Journey In A Circle

Roy A. Kennix

My two distinguished brothers and colleagues, Jones and Willingham, have described the white custodians of the black experience as "experts on the 'Negro problem' whose counsel is sought by government and private agencies when a definitive voice on the race problem is called for"¹.

Perhaps to no one does this description more fittingly apply than to Daniel Patrick Moynihan, presidential councillor, Asst. Secretary of Labor, Harvard Professor, and politician (Moynihan was an unsuccessful candidate for the 1966 Democratic nomination for New York City's Council presidency; he is now U. S. Senator from the state of New York).

Moynihan's governmental positions placed him within ready access to the President of the U. S. and the highest levels of decision-making with the U. S. federal government, particularly its executive branch. As such, Moynihan did not have to wait to be called upon for his counsel. He had right at his doorstep, avenues to the places of power in the national government. With the possible exception of Robert Wood, Moynihan's administrative and cabinet level positions gave him influence, access to power, and

power itself that hardly any of his other colleagues and fellow travelers could boast.

Moynihan has been, to say the least, assertive in utilizing the channels to executive decision-making and platforms to public opinions afforded him by his different governmental positions. Indeed, the two pieces which have made his name almost a household word in the black community, "The Negro Family: The Case for National Action", and "A Memorandum for the President on the Status of Negroes", were both prepared as efforts to influence the direction and course of presidential policy and decision-making concerning black people. Given the immense powers of the presidency in the making of public policy, there were no less than attempts to influence the overall direction of public policy itself with respect to blacks.

So, in Moynihan, we are dealing with far more than some intellectual hucksterer ensconced in an ivory tower, or researcher simply interested in writing and publishing books about black people. But rather, an activist bent on trying to make policy at the highest levels affecting blacks. Moynihan's forays into electoral politics is further proof of this.

In fact, by comparison with some of the other individuals being discussed during these sessions, e.g., Banfield and Meir, Moynihan's published works have been modest. He is best known to us as a somewhat aggressive if not brazen advocate of repugnant and sometimes subtle but nonetheless repressive political and social policies.

We have in some respect dispensed with who Moynihan is. Now let us turn our attention to what he says.

Talking about the perspectives of the white custodian, Jones and Willingham comment:

The central premise of these assumptions is that integrationism is the only programatically sound option open to black people. Other assumptions in this network include the view that the crucial political questions relative to the black struggle are tactical ones; that when dealing with the race problem fundamental political questions about the nature of society can be omitted ... The custodians see themselves as helping to clarify the race problem and thereby facilitating the efforts of those seeking solutions. However, we feel that by not incorporating the essential truth of the black experience in their analyses, they have obscured rather than clarified and impeded rather than facilitated the black struggle in America. For by conceptualizing and teaching the black experience from a frame of reference other than one of an oppressed people they have guaranteed that public discussion of the race problem and alternative proposals growing out of these discussions will seldom if ever intersect with reality².

That these comments apply to Moynihan's conceptual frame of reference are borne out by his writings and most certainly his career experiences. Moynihan's perspective

is that of liberal social reform, or as Jones and Willingham might put it, a "civil rights perspective".

Endemic to this frame of reference is an implacable and unflinching belief in the basic goodness and ultimate justice to be found in the American political and economic system - its capability and willingness to order, to permit, and to facilitate the social change requirements of blacks and for that matter anyone else. Such a perspective can only lead to the kinds of "bureaucratic tinkering" and shallow reformist legislation of which the EOA of 1964; the model cities legislation, are paradigmatic. These programs when operating at optimum can only address themselves to symptoms, never to root causes. Moynihan by his own admission was a key architect of the ill-fated war on poverty. He was one of a committee of four along with Sargent Shriver, Adam Yarmolinsky, and James Sundquist which drafted the EOA of 1964, the principal legislation creating the so-called war on poverty.

As just pointed out, the white custodian is always seeking to clarify the race problem. In the guise of empiricism, he is the omniscient chronicler and interpreter of the black experience and must set things right for the rest of the nation, for it they could only understand, the white custodian would have us believe that public policy towards blacks would change. Rainwater and Yancey in their analysis of events leading up to the so-called Moynihan report on the "Negro Family" paint a picture of Moynihan almost obsessed with a desire to pursue that work. They quote Moynihan as saying:

I woke up a couple of nights later
(that is, after one such conversation

with a highly placed optimist) at four o'clock in the morning and felt I had to write a paper about the Negro family to explain to the fellows how there was a problem more difficult than they knew and also to explain some of the issues of unemployment and housing in terms that would be new enough and shocking enough that they would say, 'well we can't let this sort of thing go on.'³ We've got to do something about it."

Hearing this, one does not know whether to laugh in derision, or grit his teeth and cuss. Perhaps the most appropriate response is that of the brother described by Fanon, whose immediate reaction to the colonialist pronouncements about concern for the conditions of blacks, is to reach for his spear.

SOME SPECIFIC ASPECTS OF THE MOYNIHAN PERSPECTIVE

The notion of the worthy versus the unworthy poor is a major aspect of the Moynihan perspective.

In their 1963 study of New York's ethnic groups, Beyond the Melting Pot, Moynihan and Glazer (we must assume that Glazer's is Moynihan's and vice-versa in a joint work of this type) raise the notion of the worthy poor. In their words:

As we tear down the slums those that remain inevitably become worse. And what after all are we to do with the large numbers of people emerging in modern society who are irresponsible and depraved? The worthy poor create no serious problem - nothing that money cannot solve. But the

unworthy poor? No one has come up
with the answers⁴.

Almost a decade later we find Moynihan continuing with this theme. Shortly after assuming office as Nixon's councillor on Urban Problems, he authored a report to Nixon in which he stressed heavily the need for the development of urban strategies designed to deal with what he referred to as an urban underclass whose anti-social behavior he maintained threatened the gains that had been made by the middle-class, which as he put it was being forced to live "side by side, cheek and jowl with a treacherous, murderous, arson prone underclass". The problem is, he argued, to convert this underclass into a working class of mail carriers and other blue collar workers.

The implications are all too clear. It suggests that not all blacks are going to be absorbed into these processes. And in effect, those who "make it" should be protected and sheltered from those who do not. Any notion of worthy poor versus non-worthy rests on a premise which does not at all attribute poverty to the ingherent structural flaws in the American political and economic system. It also lays the basis for a future policy of outright genocide. It says in effect that those who do not or "cannot" make it must be removed or eliminated from the midst of those who do make it. While crying crocodile tears for the so-called Negro middle-class, this friend of the "Negro" is laying the basis for a genocidal policy against most of us.

The majority of blacks most certainly would have to fall in Moynihan's underclass category. Moynihan tries to gloss over this fact somewhat in his now infamous memo

to Nixon on the status of Negroes by saying that "32% of all families of Negro and other races earned \$8,000 or more in 1968 compared in constant dollars with 15% in 1960"⁶. A more realistic measure of true income progress would have been the ratio of non-white to white family income which according to Labor Department data contained in Moynihan's own report, "on the Negro Family", actually declined between 1960-1963.

And what of the real chances of blacks moving out of Moynihan's underclass into blue collar working class status? They do not appear promising. The jobs themselves are not readily accessible to blacks largely because of a nexus of locational and racial factors. Seventy percent of new blue collar jobs are located in the suburbs. The majority of blacks live in the central city. Even if blacks were able to get to these jobs, the competition from lower class whites combined with ingrained racist hiring policies would not argue well for our successes.

MOYNIHAN AND THE BLACK FAMILY

Perhaps no work of Moynihan has stirred more controversy and rage among blacks than the one on the black family. It gained for him the almost complete opprobrium of practically every faction, integrationist through nationalist. Published in March, 1965 as a publication of the U. S. Department of Labor, Office of Policy Planning and Research (which Moynihan headed at the time), the Moynihan Report as it came to be known was attacked by blacks right from its inception. Some of these, however, such as the one attributed to the late Whitney Young by Rainwater, tended to obscure the report's more serious overtones for the black community:

I think that the title 'The Negro Family' was tragic in that as a result it has stigmatized an entire group of people when the majority of that group of people do not fall into the category of the Negro family that Moynihan describes. Moynihan did not point up that comparable data on low income whites would show very much the same thing. It just happened that there are more poor Negroes than there are whites. Also one can't talk about the pathologies of white society. If Negroes are sick₈ socially, then whites are sick morally₉.

The comment of King on October 29, 1975 in Westchester County was closer to the mark of expressing the serious implications of the report for blacks.

As public awareness of the breakdown of the Negro family increases there will be dangers and opportunities. The opportunity will be to deal fully rather than haphazardly with the problem as a whole-to see it as a social catastrophe and meet it as other disasters are met with an adequacy of resources. The danger will be that problems will be attributed to innate Negro weaknesses and used to justify neglect and rationalize oppression₉.

King's comments served to place the report in proper perspective. It was a mistake to engage in the numbers game with Moynihan about how much illegitimacy, etc., which many civil rights leaders did. It was, however, significant to point up the veiled attempt to once again in effect blame the victim for his condition. The report suggested that the level of slavery had

fractured the black community, especially its family structure until even massive governmental action aimed at redressing social and economic inequities would fall short. The main implication was clear. We were again being told, perhaps in more sophisticated terms, that we weren't "ready". There was need for us to pull ourselves up by our bootstraps. There were obstacles to black advancement true enough, Moynihan would admit, but somehow the basic failings were within us, as close as our own family structures; and so ingrained that they would prevent us from fully availing ourselves even of existing opportunity.

In an excerpt from his report on the black family, Moynihan gives the following incredible example of this position.

The unemployment statistics for Negro teenagers - 29 percent in January, 1965 - reflect lack of training and opportunity in the greatest measure, but it may not be doubted that they also reflect a certain failure of nerve¹⁰.

He cites further an encounter between the Secretary of Labor, Willard Wertz, and a young brother on the streets of Harlem. The brother's reply to a Wertz question concerning whether he is looking for a job is abrupt, why? This is interpreted by Moynihan as timidity, a lack of confidence, or as he puts it, nerve. When in reality the brother is simply speaking out of his own experiences and those of people he knows, about the severe difficulties encountered by blacks in finding adequately paying jobs.

The Moynihan report on the black family is tricky. Much of it is really no more than a rehash of often repeated statis-

tical data on the socio-economic conditions of the black family. Moynihan gives greatest attention to the presentation of a set of indices and references supporting his claims about the correlations between the high incidence of female-headed black families, low achievement, low motivation and general conditions of poverty. Moynihan, often quoting Frazier, concludes that these conditions mean that federal policy must be re-oriented towards the strengthening of the black family. As he summarizes: "In a word, national effort towards the problem of Negro Americans must be directed towards the question of family structure. The object should be to strength the Negro family so as to enable it to raise and support its members as do other families"¹¹.

Often times in attempting to refute the Moynihan thesis, we point to our African heritage. For example, the matrilineal family system found among the Twi speaking ethnic groups of West Africa. We also try to show how our more contemporary system of cousins and uncles seemed to compensate for the father's absence. It seems hard to discount the debilitating effects of so brutal an institution such as slavery on the black family, or the impact on the role and function of the natural father who cannot secure employment or the wherewithall of income in a society where, with the exception of the capitalist and their gangster counterparts of organized crime, some form of gainful employment is generally the source of income.

The Moynihan report is most vulnerable in its basic thesis, in that we are left to believe that the absence of stable black

families headed by the two natural parents is the most pressing problem for the black community and it is there where U. S. government policy should be directed. True to his liberal reform perspective, Moynihan is simply offering a classic position of the white custodian in proclaiming what in effect amounts to a shift in tactics and perhaps strategy. It is really a blatant contradiction. The system responsible for the present condition of the black family still persists. Within this context the emergence of permanently stable black families of the kind found in the model middle-class white community is impossible and antithetical to our position here in America. Our overall systematic oppression, as a people, militates against such family situations.

Moynihan's preoccupation with the black family should have come as no surprise to anyone familiar with his works. It emerges in practically all of them. In one of his earliest, Beyond the Melting Pot, he dwells significantly on "disorganization in the black family" and the same thing in the famous March 1, 1970 memo to Nixon. Even when recommending benign neglect, Moynihan cannot get away from his preoccupation with the black family:

The problem does not get better, it gets worse. In 1969 the proportion of husband-wife families of Negro and other races declined once again, this time to 68.7%. The illegitimacy ratio rose once again this time to 29.4% of all live births. Increasingly, the problem of the Negro poverty is the problem of the female headed family¹².

One is almost tempted to wonder aloud

at what a Freudian oriented analysis might reveal about this son of Irish immigrant parents or for that matter the results of a simple Rosharch test.

Nonetheless, if any of his works can be thought of as such, Moynihan's report on the black family is in many ways his most progressive. He does make clear that he sees the circumstances of the black community worsening instead of improving. He says "the most difficult fact for white Americans to understand is that the circumstances of the Negro American community in recent years has probably been getting worse, not better". Indices of dollars of income, standards of living and years of education decline, he tells us. "The gap between the Negro and most other groups in American society is widening"¹³.

By 1970, just five years later, he seems to have repudiated all this and in effect is now counseling benign neglect which in effect means do nothing. When queried on this, Moynihan replied he had written his memorandum with a two-fold purpose: "To being the President up-to-date on the quite extra-ordinary progress within the Negro community during the last decade and to suggest ways in which these gains might be consolidated".

What progress? How could so much improvement in the black condition occur in the five years since the gloomy findings of his report on the black family? Such a conclusion could only be arrived at by one structually isolated from the black community, unable to unwilling to look at and to perceive the real nature of black oppression in America.

ANOTHER WORLD AND REJECTION OF NATIONALISM

The white custodian's total removal from involvement in the black experience at best makes him a detached, distant and sterile observer. Despite the crocodile tears and cries of righteous indignation shed over the plight of blacks, the white custodian remains true to the American political and economic system. But constant reference to the white custodian's commitments to the existing political and economic system is not intended to suggest that white leftists are any more insightful about the black experience. They seem to be saying, let us oppress you under another kind of system. But no, a foot in the pants is still a foot in the pants.

Moynihan's concerns in Beyond the Melting Pot and the "Black Family" are strongly concerned with what might be termed as fragmentation and disorganization within black communities. Indeed, in his latest work, Maximum Feasible Misunderstanding, he dwells extensively on this subject, while recounting the theories of his fellow white custodians that formed the conceptual basis for the war on poverty. He sees the EOA of 1964, especially the community action section, as having been an outgrowth of theories and feelings about the need to build cohesive and closely knit community structures¹⁴. It should be indicated, somewhat parenthetically, that the ideas of Merton and Durkheim were strongly present in the thinking of influential white sociologists and social workers around the advent of the war on poverty, Moynihan included.

Although self-determination and nationalism are logical conceptual approaches towards overcoming conditions of anomic dis-

organization which Moynihan and his colleagues see in the black community, nonetheless such notions are invariably and predictably perceived by them in negative terms. Of nationalism, he says, in Beyond the Melting Pot:

What the future of this exclusivist outlook and feeling will be, it is hard to say, but it does not seem that it can be more than a temporary tendency. Whatever the psychological satisfactions of the present mood, it is doubtful that it is the way to get gains for the Negro community, in jobs, in influence, in prestige or in practical policies. One can reject white standards of beauty, one can devote oneself to the study of African history and culture, one may support the policy of African states. There will be more and more of this, and this is all to the good. But Africa and nationalism and exclusivism will have as little to do in changing the conditions of American Negro life as Israel and Zionism have to do with the conditions of American Jewish life¹⁵.

And in the next breath, unwittingly, in vulgar terms no doubt, Moynihan builds a case for nationalism. He says: "There are tasks that no one but Negroes can do". He goes on to call for black-led efforts in education, crime, delinquency prevention, and in the provision of general social services¹⁶. Interestingly enough, since 1963 no work of Moynihan fails to make some reference to the viability of the Muslim movement. At no time, however, does Moynihan even suggest by implication that he grasps its significance except in negative terms. Community control, a sometimes embryonic form

of nationalism, is seen by Moynihan in Maximum Feasible Misunderstanding as something that is "a perfectly reasonable proposal to try out", but nothing else¹⁷.

EPILOGUE

As we leave Moynihan, he appears to be somewhat jaded with his activist role. We find him back in academia, battered, bruised and wounded. The infighting in Washington and the barbs from the black community finally seem to have taken their tolls on this Gaelic warrior, this savior and friend of the Negro. In his lament on the demise of community action in the war on poverty, Maximum Feasible Misunderstanding, the great theorist on the black family is found quite passively commenting on the role of the social sciences. He says, "the role of social science lies not in the formulation of social policy, but in the measurement of the results"¹⁸. This sounds like a far cry from the man who five years prior could not sleep night for thinking about theoretical approaches and program directions concerning the black family. It can be truthfully said that with friends like Moynihan, who needs George Wallace? To follow Moynihan is truly a journey in a circle.

True to his ethos, Moynihan remains forever the apologist for the American system of racism and capitalism. Even so obviously defective, inept, and insincere an approach to poverty as was the EOA of 1964, Moynihan is still not able to see this. Rather instead, he blames its failings on incorrect and untested sociological strategies and tactics. Nowhere does he suggest that there may be something funda-

mentally defective about this system that within its present context precludes the elimination of poverty or a decent and acceptable existence for blacks. Not even the admitted exclusion of blacks from the planning of the war on poverty which of itself made that endeavor suspect right from the outset seems to bother Moynihan. But rather instead it was the application of untested tactics.

Finally, it would be the height of folly and irrelevancy for us to accept an interpretation of social science leaving to it simply a calibrating function. Our position here in this country and throughout the diaspora, cry out for a kind of social science that will sear and shatter the consciousness of our people, and point out viable options and strategies to a secure and just liberation. Just as DuBois utilized the tools of the newly emerging discipline of sociology to shatter and expose theories of racial inferiority, abounding during his time, so must we practice an activist and advocacy-oriented social science which exposes and exorcises the racists, apologists and obscurantists outside and within our midst.

REFERENCES CITED/FOOTNOTES

¹Mack H. Jones and Alex Willingham, "White Custodians of the Black Experience". Social Science Quart., Vol. 51, No. 1, June, 1970, p. 31.

²Ibid., p. 32.

³Lee Rainwater and William Y. Yancey. The Moynihan Report and the Politics of Controversy. (Cambridge, 1967, p. 25).

⁴Nathan Glazer and Daniel Moynihan, Beyond The Melting Pot, (Cambridge, 1963, p. 64).

⁵Ibid.

⁶Daniel P. Moynihan, "Memorandum for the President on the Position of Negroes", New York Times, March 1, 1970.

⁷Rainwater, op. cit., -. 24.

⁸Ibid., -. 202.

⁹Ibid.

¹⁰Ibid., -. 90.

¹¹Ibid., p. 93.

¹²Moynihan, "Memorandum for the President ..."
op. cit.

¹³Rainwater, op. cit., p.44.

¹⁴Daniel P. Moynihan, Maximum Feasible Misunderstanding, (N.Y., 1970, p. 3).

¹⁵Glazer and Moynihan, op. cit., p. 79.

¹⁶Ibid., -. 84.

¹⁷Moynihan, op. cit., p. 161.

¹⁸Ibid., p. 193.

What Has Really Changed?

Adolph Reed, Sr.

It seems that since the "Triumph of Industrial Revolution" during the Civil War and Reconstruction era, each half-century has treated the American people to a juicy scandal in presidential administrations.

First, there was Ulysses S. Grant and his gang of good guys. Roughly 50 years later the colorful thieves and high-livers of the Hon. Warren G. Harding's presidency made their imprint with the immortal symbol known as Teapot Dome. Now, at the inception of the third fifty-year period, there is the "scandal of scandals", Watergate, which may have sent vibrations even into the tangles of the Amazon rain forests.

In the first two instances, of Grant's and Harding's administrations, the "party line", as reflected in textbooks, academia and the media in general, proclaimed that once the scandals were exposed, the political and governmental processes were cleansed, that the "errors" of the Grant era and Teapot Dome were basically just aberrations from the basic pattern of good government.

There is, however, the point of view that the thievery which came to light relative to these administrations is normal in the political and governmental processes. In fact there are those who find such inci-

dents amusing; how could one avoid a hearty laugh when reading Alice Roosevelt Longworth's observations of the Harding White House?

But Watergate is unique, it appears, in several important ways which for some reason escapes the attention of those who have written and spoken endless millions of words on appraisal of Richard Nixon's "law 'n order", seen in the perspective of Watergate as his Waterloo.

One thing the unfolding of Watergate reveals is that the rich and powerful purchase the "public interest" by placing in the palms of public officials money and favors, in essentially the same manner the non-affluent purchase 80¢ per lb. dried beans from the local supermarket.

If Harold Lasswell's thesis that politics and government are concerned essentially with "who gets what when, and how" (and its logical corollary, "who does not get what when, and how") is reasonably valid, Watergate points up dramatically that those without power in the form of money can expect nothing except, at best, tokens from the brothers who affect public policies and who determine the "national interest".

As sordid as the Nixon gang of thugs were and are, they may not have invented the process by which the rich and powerful purchase public policies that benefit the rich and powerful.

\$600,000,000 of public funds to subsidize the executives of Penn-Central Railroad, and the \$250,000,000 donation to Lockheed, billions to agri-business "farmers", and innumerable other illustrations, suggest strongly that the cultural glorification of "free enterprise" contains as much substance, as much reality, as Billy Graham and Norman

V. Peale's infamous White House "sermons".

As some observers see it, there is in fact "socialism" for the affluent and "free enterprise" for the non-affluent.

Incidentally, for those who praise Richard Nixon for "ending the war" and "bringing the boys home" and "detente" with the People's Republic of China and the USSR, they might reflect on the story of the young man who murdered his parents in order to collect their insurance. When apprehended and brought to trial, he pleaded for mercy on the grounds that he was an orphan.

If it had not been for Nixon and various of his cohorts in the late 1940s and the 1950s, there would have been no Cold War in the first place. As for Nixon and Kissinger's "peace with honor", there are those who contend that the same "peace" could have been attained on Jan. 21, 1969, when he first assumed his office, without the loss of tens of thousands of lives and billions of dollars.

Apparently the public image of President Ford as a "good guy" is valid. But much more than decency is required to correct what may be the fundamental human problem in this society - - the criminal maldistribution of the products of the technological machine. There is no humanistic justification for chronic poverty in the midst of plenty; for the absence of meaningful national health insurance; for a permanent war economy (which in many ways is a "respectable" WPA) - - permanent war economy without an "enemy". If Nixon's "detente" is the official policy, why is there need for yet more sophisticated weaponry? Against whom will it be used?

In a word, Watergate and its seemingly endless spin-offs demonstrate that, (1)

public policies are bought and sold, (2) that the "public interest" is ascertained by criteria which equate, symbolically, the Chase Manhattan Bank with the "national interest", and (3) that "democracy", "the democratic process", "representative government" and such terms are largely only slogans and euphemisms, although believed by millions of American citizens.

Admittedly Mssrs. terHorst and Ford appear at this early date as vintage French champagne when compared to Richard Nixon and Ziegler, who were like near-beer. But does this portend fundamental changes from government geared primarily for the rich and powerful to government geared primarily to promoting and executing humanistic programs?

Watergate and its exposure and the inglorious exit of Nixon and cohorts have not come close to solving the fundamental problem outlined above. It is probable that a full-scale House impeachment and subsequent Senate trial would have glaringly revealed that "the system" itself is the real problem - - very likely some members of the "Rich and the Super Rich" of Lundberg or the "Power Elite" of Mills recognized the danger of such an exposure. Thus Richard Nixon became expendable, and was forced to walk the plank in disgrace.

But the "unmentionable" implications of the scandal may still be there in the future, with a Ford-Rockefeller White House. Nixon was not and is not the system; he is a logical product of it. The root causes of Watergate have likely not been touched.

I'm Not A Crook's Successor

Adolph Reed, Sr.

The late Lyndon Johnson once observed that Gerald Ford is the only man he had ever known who could not walk and chew gum at the same time. Though Mr. Ford's behavior as a replacement for the "law 'n order" predecessor who announced to the world that he was "not a crook" may seem to validate Mr. Johnson's observation, it could be that "Plain Jerry" - - the one who with assumed naivete toasts his own English muffins in the morning-- is a carefully calculated public image designed to permit the same shafting of the poor and middle classes that has been going on for so long.

In other words, President Ford may be "dumb" like a fox.

Mr. Ford managed to remain in the House of Representatives for nearly a quarter of a century, becoming minority leader in that body of highly ethical men and women. Worse, he maneuvered himself into being the replacement for the second half of the law 'n order team whose first half eventually had to insist "I'm not a crook".

As for the "good guy" image of Mr. Ford, it should be asked who among all the Nixon appointees possesses the same image? Does it not seem that a fundamental requirement for appointment to the "non-crook" team was that the appointee must be amoral, capable

of any anti-humanistic act in the name of "national security" or some other cover for lying, deception and further enriching the corporate rich?

The usual felon is provided with a cheap suit and a ten or twenty-dollar bill upon release from jail. Mr. Ford requested the American people to retain the Squire of San Clemente and Key Biscayne in a state of splendor that Louis XIV would have envied. Does it not seem that a fundamental requirement for appointment by a man such as the "non-crook" would be the bestowance of such favor?

Mr. Ford continued the "non-crook's" team of antihumanistic parasites such as Simon, Butz, and Greenspan, as well. Simon is apparently to go unpunished for the thievery of \$300,000,000 by some oil companies through the infamous "double dip" loophole allowed by the Federal Energy Office which Simon headed at the time. It was a loophole which none of the nine oil company officials "assisting" Mr. Simon remember dreaming up -- a circumstance very similar to the 18½-minute gap on Mr. Nixon's tape which Alexander Haig explained as having been done by some "sinister outside force", presumable Satan. A member of the House Committee which ostensibly investigated the rip-off commented that it was apparently the result of the 2nd "Immaculate Conception". Mr. Simon, instead of being fired, was promoted to Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. Ford appointed the "liberal" Nelson Rockefeller as his own possible successor. It might be said of the Rockefeller family that it controls the lives of more people, on all planets, than has any other family in history. There were some people who were

a bit surprised to hear that the first earthmen to land on the moon did not find a branch of the Chase Manhattan Bank, brother David's piece of the family heritage. The moon is actually the only place where earthmen have been that there is no Chase Manhattan activity.

And if there had by some chance been petroleum found in some of the moon rocks, there is no doubt that the Nixon-Ford government - - of which Rockefeller was the logical continuation - - would have begun construction of a 240,000-mile pipeline to the moon, in the interest of "national security", which Ford and Rockefeller could now be reaping the benefits from.

Kissinger worked in close tandem with the "non-crook" of San Clemente, and it is no surprise that he stayed around in the "non-crook's" follower's administration. Mr. Ford stumbled all over himself in praise of this "man of peace" (where is the "peace" in Indochina which Kissinger-Nixon arranged at so long and bloody a price?).

Simon and Butz still have their jobs. Kissinger still has his. Rockefeller is an old "new" face in the team. And Ford confers with the "non-crook" still. For him to solicit counsel on affairs of state from Nixon - - and it seems that he does -- makes as much sense as a bank president soliciting advice from John Dillinger.

But then it makes as much sense as having a Rockefeller on the team during a tentative attack on what Mr. Ford refers to as "public enemy #1" -- inflation. Just

what does this attack involve?

President Ford is and has been throughout his public career, in the tradition of virtually all his predecessors in the Oval Office, basically a servant of, and true believer in, the anti-humanistic, profit and power oriented creed of the corporate rich and of the rich in general. With Butz, the leering and sadistic Secretary of Agriculture, the cunning Paladin of the Rockefellers, "have valise, will travel" Kissinger, Greenspan, Simon, Morton et al., and above all, advice from the "non-crook" elder statesman from San Clemente, the human race can expect more of the same lying, deceptive and energetic "benign neglect" of the lower and middle income groups, and even more energetic policies and programs favoring the rich. It can expect an economic policy summed up by the word - nothing.

Mr. Ford is in his own right a "worthy" and appropriate successor to the "non-crook". He is as naive as a fox.

Nation-Building As Protracted Struggle: The Role Of Education

Shelby L. Smith

Nation-building is a continuous process. It takes place in old, established states, newly independent states and in liberation movements. At its best, nation-building is part of the protracted struggle of a people seeking at the same time prosperity, equality, justice, freedom and humanity.

A number of scholars view the nation-building process as a national development movement that is launched at the conclusion of political independence or self-government. These scholars characterize the activity of national governments in "developing nations" as social, economic, political engineering with the aim of producing political entities modeled after the western prototype nation-state. Unfortunately, a number of leaders in developing nations share this narrow view of nation-building.

As currently conceptualized, the term nation-building implies that a territorial unit, a country with international boundaries, and identity has not yet become a nation¹. Aristide Zolberg notes that the concept of nation provides a universal model employed by the politically conscious strata of almost all countries in the world, but that in Asia and Africa that model is a

very general one². He further notes that:
... The very words nation-building suggest a prevalent feeling that the edifice is far from completed, but also that the new rulers have a particular attitude to the problem: A nation does not merely happen as a result of historical forces; it does not merely entail liberation from oppression or from the cocoon of false identity. It must be designed and the plan must be executed. This takes precedence over all other tasks, including economic development³.

This absence of nationhood in the developing areas of Africa and Asia has been described by Leonard Binder in terms of ethnic heterogeneity; the lack of shared political culture; social cleavages such as rural/urban groups, tribal groupings, etc.; disparate levels of development within a territory, the gap between elite and non-elite groups and the difficulty in the creating of legitimacy and stability⁴.

In his 1968 book, Politics in Transitional Societies, Harvey Kebschull cautions scholars who look at nation-building in the developing areas by suggesting that every generalization about developing nations is subject to many exceptions and qualifications. Each state has its distinctive pattern of resources, institutions, and processes, and each confronts a particular array of problems⁵.

Rajani goes even further when he states that "modernization and political development are empty concepts"⁶. He feels that these concepts and the approach to nation-building revolving around these concepts are not empty simply because of their origin, or in their application to developing areas, but "empty of socio-economic content, not

informed by any historical points of reference, and always underplaying the structural constraints operating on the political process"⁷. He further suggests that users of these terms show an appalling lack of concern for the international structure of dominance and dependence. In Education and Political Development, Lucien Pye indicates that a fundamental contradiction lies at the heart of the modernization & nation-building process. This is the contradiction between the universalistic aspects of modernization and the need to give expression to the uniqueness of the particular culture⁸.

Kebschull feels that students of the nation-building process have a two-fold challenge. First, a conceptual frame-work must be constructed that will make possible simultaneous, systematic analysis of diverse western and non-western political systems, and second, the framework of analysis will have to be carefully applied to individual political systems⁹. He suggests that the problem of defining and understanding unfamiliar cultures, values and institutions is further complicated by the highly personal, informal and undifferentiated nature of some political systems¹⁰. For, as Rajani points out:

... Major differentials in the process of development pertain not just to degrees of urbanization, industrialization, etc., which lead from tradition to modernity; but rather to the relationship between modernization of the traditional network of society -- of agriculture and the rural countryside ... on the one hand and the growth of a mobile, educated, middle class on the other¹¹.

Nation-building in Africa is a phenomenon associated with independence. The new states see national development as a part of nation-building. In fact, as A. Rivkin observed in his 1969 work on Nation-Building in Africa, they somehow feel that "a nation state has not been built unless and until it has produced a modern economy"¹². This attitude is shared by Lofchie who, in The State of the Nations: Constraints on Development in Independent Africa, holds that the generation of economic growth in Africa is a state function primarily because autonomous economic elites are lacking¹³. One of the problems, then, faced by these new nations is the lack of time for sequential treatment of development crisis. Finally, Rivkin provides us with a rather lengthy, but comprehensive definition of how nation-building is used by this genre of scholars.

.... Nation-building in Africa is the process of defining the geographic area in which a particular state is to be built and developing the constitutional structure to give the state form and shape, the political system to give it life and provide the means for the population to relate to the state, and the economy to sustain the state structure and political system -- all with a view to welding the multiple, disparate, noncohesive and unrelated population groups to be found in all the new states of Africa into identifiable and integrated nations within their respective borders¹⁴.

While these theories of nation-building exclude the initial stages of struggle which are inherently nation-building in nature and

process, they do provide us with descriptive and analytical data on the problems and concerns of post independent states in the Third World. Nevertheless, it seems apparent that this approach to the nation-building process fails to adequately explain liberation movements, the struggle for liberation among blacks in North America and the independence movements themselves. To imply that these movements are less than "nation-building" in focus and process is to suggest that you begin building nations only after inheriting state apparatus or only after nominal independence is gained.

This is a contradiction of no mean measure. A careful look at the underlying assumptions of liberation movements on the continent and elsewhere suggest that the actors are seeking to produce certain attitudes and skills; gain specific resources and build institutions which will contribute to nationhood. They are making the first steps, basic steps, necessary steps in the nation-building process. Without these efforts, nominal independence over a specified geographical area would have little meaning. In addition, the goals, objectives and processes set into motion during pre-independence stages of struggle provide the tone and rhythm for the nation-building process of the post independence era.

It seems logical, then, to assume that nation-building is a multidimensional, multifaceted process that takes place during every stage and at every level of political struggle. And it would appear that at least three basic and distinct processes or phases are involved in nation-building.

(1) Politicization or preparing people for resistance and struggle. Providing the rationale, slogans; stating the issues; re-

vealing the historical and contemporary problems and enemies, i.e., defining the nature of struggle and transmitting this to the population while simultaneously mobilizing the population for struggle.

(2) Overt struggle or the period wherein there is a consciousness of goals and means and there is protest, armed struggle or other forms of covert resistance.

(3) National development or post independence clarification of the direction that the new actors must take; the process of socializing or resocializing the population to the liberationist ideology and providing skills to support state apparatus.

Once these three functions or stages are carried out the former liberationists become established and devote themselves primarily to systems maintenance. This is not to suggest that the efforts to maintain the in-roads gained during different levels of struggle are not in some ways maintenance oriented, but merely to distinguish between the major focus being on change and the realization that after political liberation comes the desire to retain, i.e., systems maintenance.

However one views this process, it soon becomes evident that some form of education, either formal or informal, directed or incidental, comes into play at every stage of struggle. In its broadest sense, education is a tool upon which political liberation movements depend. In addition, one might add that education itself is a liberating endeavor. It frees the mind from entangled facts, myths and colonized knowledge and allows for creativity, wholesomeness and new directions and dimensions. In a word, education is at the

root of change. Dr. Leslie McLemore once observed that "Education can be a force for oppression as well as a force for liberation"¹⁵. In this context, and when speaking of the role that education plays in nation-building, we are referring specifically to the way in which knowledge is used. We mean, in addition, a process of informing; a process of analyzing that information; a process of implementing or translating the analysis to concrete reality. We mean an education that fosters a particular ideology or movement -- directed education.

This education effects, shapes and limits the scope of information analysis and transmission. For if certain information is purposefully gathered to the exclusion of other information and the manner in which it is gathered further contaminates the data, one is analyzing already biased information and regardless of rigorous analytical procedure, the information is likely to be transmitted to individuals whose attitudes and behavior are pre-ordained by this whole knowledge acquisition process.

Further, when we remember that decision making, policies and opinions result from information gathering, processing and transmission as well as internalization, we can see clearly that one who controls the flow of knowledge and education has significant control over the direction of mankind.

Attitudes and approaches to education grow out of a framework about the role and importance of education in a society; and the values, practices and needs of a society are reflected in its educational system. Educational systems are never passive and objective institutions. Both formal and informal educational structures are conscious

schools of the dominant group in a society and institutionalization of these educational structures maximize the system's stability and maintenance.

Julius Nyerere maintains that educational systems in different kinds of societies in the world differ in organization and content. They differ because the societies providing the education are different, and because education has a purpose. That purpose is to transmit from one generation to the next the accumulated wisdom and knowledge of the society, and to prepare the young people for their future membership in the society and their active participation in its maintenance and development¹⁶. This view of education suggests a clear understanding of national educational systems as fundamentally conservative structures whose primary function is systems maintenance. Through transmitting the values and attitudes of the society to the youth, the perpetuation of that society is aided.

Further, it is important to understand that educational systems are valuable political weapons. They are service institutions which, rather than make attitudes and political values for society, most often serve to foster the dominant credo to the neglect of other values or groups within a society. In an effort to demonstrate the continuous nature of the nation-building process and the role of education at every stage and every level of struggle, two situations facing African peoples will be examined. First, the protracted struggle of Africans in North America, and second, the post independence struggle of African peoples on the continent. Both situations will be examined with a view toward illustrating the effect of colonization on African attitudes and the effects of colonized

knowledge on the two situations. A third and logical area of struggle which deserves a great deal more attention than could be given it in this paper will not be examined here. That is the area of Southern Africa where liberation struggle is most clear cut. However, it should be pointed out that Cabral, Mondelane, Machel and other liberation leaders recognize the vital role that education, in its broadest sense, plays in this effort to simultaneously politicize, wage armed warfare and set up state apparatus for government. Included in the "battle plans" for liberation movements are education programs and doctrines as well as mobile schools which serve the purpose of providing short range skills and attitudes to support the day-to-day struggle and attitudes, and manpower training for those who have specified roles to play in the projected new order. Nation-building is an ongoing part of liberation movements throughout the world. Without this emphasis on control of information, knowledge direction and dissimulation, the success of these struggles would be less than satisfactory.

NATION-BUILDING IN NORTH AMERICA

The struggle of Africans in North America provides us with a special and unique set of circumstances. These circumstances of existence as part of, yet apart from, the society which oppresses us make some degree of control over educational resources crucial to survival itself and make enlightened use of these resources absolutely essential to change and progress.

We are all painfully aware of the fact that the formal and informal apparatus for making and dissminating information is

controlled by nonblacks and that blacks are forced to participate in the financing of these structures and thus are left with little extra finance to develop alternative structures. Further, there is little that can be done to isolate the black population from the images, data, ideas, etc., that are beamed at them from all sides. I refer to this bombardment of propaganda in the U. S. as "society saturated education". The danger inherent in a dilemma of this magnitude makes the progress of the nation-building process dependent in part on the control of the propaganda that reaches a population and makes evident the need to design informational pamphlets and programs that speak to the aspirations, needs and realities of those who struggle.

Three types of alternatives are being pursued by blacks who face this situation: (1) dropout or total withdrawal, (2) reform through work from within, and (3) the creation of independent structures for the education of the black population. As most blacks are cut off from the international environment, they often fail to realize that theirs is a global struggle and therefore seek sectional and regional remedies to global problems. This is self-defeating and time consuming as well as devisive. But, a look at the philosophy of U. S. education and the principles which guide its implementation should make the plight of those who struggle more understandable.

National educational systems mirror the political, social and economic structures of a nation, so that when one focuses on the educational system of a people one uncovers the underpinnings, goals and contradictions of that people. If the American

educational network is analyzed, for example, it becomes obvious that different and opposing groups (classes and races) make up American society. Further, certain values and basic assumptions about the subordinate and superordinate relationship extant and the disposition and roles of the citizenry are incorporated into the formal and informal educational channels.

W. E. B. DuBois suggested that education is a life long process of teaching central values to a society. He recognized, however, that education is partisan and that dissatisfied groups within the society who seek to use the educational system as a means of liberation must, of necessity, advocate subversive education¹⁷. Education, then, for black folks in America could and should serve a different purpose than that evidenced in the national system. Instead of inculcating dominant values and contributing to systems maintenance, it should seek to undermine those aspects of the dominant credo that lead to the subservience of black folks and, ultimately, seek systems disruption.

In his book, Education as Cultural Imperialism, Martin Carnoy analyzes and documents the reasons and methods used by European and American capitalists to spread capitalist attitudes and create capitalist markets in Africa, Asia, Latin-America and in the U. S. through the use of education. He notes that schooling was brought to non-Europeans as part of empire, and to workers in the metropolis as a function of capitalist needs; it was integrated into an effort to bring indigenous peoples into imperial/colonial structures¹⁸. What Carnoy does not discuss, but implies, is that the educational systems of a number of nations serve

as channels for insuring political and social demonation, and that subservient or dependent groups should find that educational policy set-up by the colonialist is contrary to their interests. This analysis suggests the need to change the educational system, to re-channel it or to create new structures if education is to be one avenue towards liberation for dependent and/or oppressed peoples in the Third World, and elsewhere.

Most of us are products of American educational structures which set the tone for self-concepts and awareness of history and culture of peoples all over the globe. In physics, health sciences, history and civics we are made to feel that knowledge and/or education is a white monopoly. Anything that speaks of a black or African perspective is interpereted by many as ethnic or narrow and in no way worthy of general transmission in the form of a world view meriting legitimization. However, if we agree with the basic notion that all knowledge is compartmentalized for the purpose of convenience and that how one comes to the facts and how one relates them to self and others constitutes a world view; and that the white or western world view is no more objective or universal than is the black, Chicano, or Arab world view, we must conclude that what enters here is the fact that white control of political institutions which lead to control of educational institutions legitimizes the while view and makes it "universal" here and in the neo-colonized areas of the world.

It follows then that any black effort toward nation-building in America must begin with the realization that in a capitalist, racist and corrupt society the educa-

tional system will prepare youths to accept, rationalize and function in the interests of that society. It will create attitudes supportive of the various roles of opposing groups in the society and it will prepare manpower to service the institutions which underpin this unsavory structure. In addition, the incremental changes gleaned by so-called liberal and leftists innovators in the education system do little to change the mainstream tide or to alter or even offset the channelling of the dominant credo to society's youth. As an arm of society, the powerful educational system produces the manpower to run the system and the attitudes to support the system.

Now, what I am suggesting in this discussion is that nation-building and liberation must be fostered through a process of education in addition to other means. This process must begin with a realization of enlightened self interests and must be conducted via enlightened means and maintained through attitudinal formation or social engineering. Further, I suggest that the process of nation-building depends on the way in which knowledge is defined and interpreted, i.e., politicization, purposeful struggle and development are dependent upon education in its broadest sense. This thesis is based on the fundamental belief that knowledge itself can be colonized and that colonized knowledge is primarily responsible for the unliberated state of the world; perpetuates the hierarchical structure of society and accounts in part for the need to initiate a process of nation-building.

In their volume on Education and Black Struggle, the Institute of the Black World (IBW) makes an effort to critically

analyze existing forms of colonized education in the Third World (including Black America). They offer recommendations for alternative forms of a new education; an education for liberation¹⁸. The IBW volume goes even further by asserting that institutionalized, regulated, formal instruction such as that associated with schools, scarcely qualifies as "education". Education, as they define it, is first a consciousness of the existence of truth, and second, a desire to seek out that truth for oneself¹⁹.

Ivan Illich argues that the net effect of education or what is more rightly called schooling on society is negative. It de-means and makes a mockery of potential capability and prevents the masses from understanding the power relationships in society while separating the masses from technology and its controls²⁰.

If this information is brought to bear on the educational system in the U. S., the evidence forces us to agree with Colin Greer who states that American public schools have always failed the lower classes, both white and black. Further, public schools have only been public in the sense that what happens inside them is typical of what happens outside; they have never been public in the distribution of their favors²¹. Public schools in America have engaged in the rhetoric of chance and have propounded an ideology of reform, especially during the 1960s, but this ideology and reform functioned in support of stability and maintenance of existing social structures. In effect, the schools of this country have carried out the programs written for them by society; they have perpetuated racism, hierarchy, capitalism and corruption.

Black folks, therefore, must realize that educational reform and minor curriculum changes do not alter significantly the impact of the educational system in a society -- it is not the stuff of which nations are built. Nation-building for blacks implies that the entire structure must change if the oppression is to cease. This change must be comprehensive enough to include resocialization of personnel as well as organizational, content and policy changes because the attitudes of teachers and administrators have been shaped by the old system, and new bottles do not change old wine. In addition, this change must be accompanied by a revamping of society itself for "education" is part of the life experiences of people and the formal educational structure is only one aspect of a society's institutions.

In many ways, the most powerful education blacks have undergone in this country has taken place quite outside schools and quite contrary to the democratic rhetoric of the main line, i.e., white educational institutions. It has been a powerful socialization in what it means to be powerless. In various times and places it has meant walking -- white children rode -- living under a system of law and order in which no black has a voice²².

Alan Westin observes that education will always be shaped by the dominant credo and power relationships of society, as well as its prevailing images of roles to be played by various citizen groups²³. And Cobbs and Grier note that education has never offered a significant solution to the black man's dilemma in America²⁴. As American education is presently constituted, Cobbs and Grier are correct, and on the basis of the efforts made thus far to change these con-

ditions, there is little likelihood that their views will be challenged in the next few years.

Educators in North America have not served to ameliorate the exploitative nature of education in this society and have made no concerted effort to expose this exploitation through a systematic analysis of the role that education plays in perpetuating the power structure of this society. It is clear that this hierarchy and exploitation are based on race and wealth, but the manner in which either or both of these is perpetuated has not been dealt with. There have been a number of studies indicating ways in which political information is learned and the effect of this process on attitudes²⁵. In addition, analyses of the political content of media and civics type books and courses have been undertaken by political scientists and other social scientists. Few, however, have sought to explain the process by which materials get excluded from educational documents.

For example, Beyer did a content analysis of American history books to determine the quantity and quality of information about Africa in the texts. He discovered that little information was given and when it did appear it was placed at the back of the book or deeply hidden²⁶ in the middle and it was usually distorted. What he and others who executed similar studies failed to do is explain the relationship between their findings and the nature of political ideology and societal structure in America; and the process - people and avenues used - by which a racist society is perpetuated. They often do, however, indicate the effect that such distortions have on black and white Americans, yet the reasons and manner

of political control of the educational system are not examined in the context of systematic exposure to the politics of education in this country.

Another educational area in which political scientists have failed as responsible scholars is that of analyzing direct political action by black and other minority groups in this country.

The introduction of mass political pressure and civil disobedience during the civil rights period was not dealt with from an empirical standpoint. Black activity was not given the serious study and analysis that would have aided in clarifying the movement's goals as well as the contradictions of a society which would make it necessary for a large percentage of the citizenry to demonstrate for fundamental rights due all citizens.

The activities by students at black colleges and universities, such as raising the black flag of liberation on the campus of Southern University in New Orleans, and the subsequent reactions of state and local officials such as the shooting down of unarmed students on state college campuses in Jackson, Miss. and Baton Rouge, La. have not been raised to the level of political analysis that the acts merit. The implications of such acts on future political socialization of college youth; the importance of these acts as symbols of the injustices of this society and as unique strategies to deal with old problems; the theoretical and practical dimensions of black student activity and tactics like other black behavior in this country, have been given lesser recognition than related activity by white groups (the SDA, for example). And this with full knowledge that blacks initiated this type of

activity. Political scientists have generally acted to confuse rather than clarify issues of race, class and oppression as related to black student activity.

Other areas that deserve concern and serious examination are those involving: (1) methodology of black political leadership, (2) political strategy of the poor²⁷, (3) the politics of ethnic identity, (4) political obligations of the powerless, (5) foreign policy views of the oppressed, (6) black Americans as part of the Third World, (7) black independent political movements, and (8) criminology and black protest.

Carefull examination of these areas and an awareness of the role of education in protracted struggle should result in a more informed and effective persuance of national development. It would assist the continuous process of nation-building in North America.

NATION-BUILDING IN POST INDEPENDENT AFRICA

The new states of Africa spend about 25-30 percent of their national budgets on education compared to a relatively small percentage spent by older nation states. These new states, as Peshkin suggests, expect the schools to produce the labor force for their manpower requirements, the leadership for their bureaucracies, and the citizenry for an enlightened social order²⁸.

A number of scholars recognize the importance accorded to education in the nation-building process in Africa, but some question the wisdom of such strong reliance on educational systems as agents of change. Prewitt and Okello maintain that even though the making of the citizen

may be an essential ingredient in nation-building, the feasibility of a political education program as the most effective first thrust instrument for this task is doubtful²⁹. However, Koff and Van derMuhl hold that education is possibly the only logical first thrust instrument for the task of nation-building. They maintain that "it is in the new nations that one can see most clearly a simple but important truth about political socialization; namely, citizens are made, not born"³⁰. Thus the educational system must be harnessed to the task of nation-building in order to create the attitudes and manpower necessary for development. One of the most prolific writers in the education and nation-building area of African development, James Coleman, remarks on the irony of the importance placed on education as an instrument for change in the new states of Africa: "Once regarded as an essentially conservative, culture-preserving, culture-transition institution; the educational system now tends to be viewed as the master determinant of all aspects of change"³¹.

Theoretically, a uniform program of education for nation-building can be designed and implemented by a political system but this is a difficult role for the developing states. They must develop and transmit to the population an ideology while simultaneously transforming the attitudes of the population as well as the structure of the society and the state³². The difficulty of effecting a task of this magnitude is reflected both in governmental programs and in citizens' attitudes. Thus, a basic understanding of the role of education in the nation-building process in

Africa must be informed in at least three areas: (1) national and educational policy, (2) the structure and dynamics of the educational system itself, and (3) the attitudes of students, teachers, administrators and the citizenry.

Having gone through certain phases of struggle, primarily that for political independence, the nations of Africa are faced with the problems of using the educational systems they inherited from the colonial powers as tools for change, or starting anew with systems and programs fashioned to the realities of their particular situation and needs. Unfortunately, few African nations responded to the need to design structures that served functions different from those that the inherited structures or institutions were designed to serve. They attempted to use the model for oppression as the vehicle for liberation. Only after this became obvious did some nations begin to re-think the whole question of ideology and institute nation-building vehicles that served the needs of African peoples. However, even with this realization, a number of observers feel that many nation-builders, policy planners and scholars interested in modernization fail to take account of the complexity of the process. They take as truisms such statements like "education is the ^{key} that unlocks the door to modernization"³³. While it is true that the educated elites are usually the forces of change in developing societies, the gap between the elite and the masses is large and thus the educational system alone cannot be expected to change an entire population, especially within one or two decades. Yet, education seems to be indispensable to modernization and political

development. And there are those who, like Almond and Verba, feel that education is necessary to effective political participation, and democracy.

All national educational systems indoctrinate the coming generation with the basic outlook and values of the political order. But in most developing areas, neither doctrine, administrative structures, teaching materials, nor teachers have been adequately marshalled to the task of citizenship training or political indoctrination. And as Alan Peshkin rightly points out in an article on "Education and National Integration in Negeria", "... it is self-evident that the schools cannot reflect a nationalism which does not exist. Schools do not usually create beliefs, attitudes, or values; they communicate them from sources outside the school"³⁵.

It is generally felt that there are two reasons why educational systems are so important to nation-building, and why they bear a much heavier load in the developing areas than in old nations. One of these reasons is the imperative of nation-building which dictates that the national government counter the continued primacy of the family as socializer for the bulk of the population. Secondly, it is one of the most effective and available means of transforming society³⁶.

Along with Prewitt and Okello, I would argue that national development is related to education and that a necessary, though not sufficient, condition for programmed political education is a nationalistic doctrine, and a means of transmitting that doctrine³⁷. Programmed political education is a useful vehicle for

instilling into the youth of new nations those values considered appropriate for nation-building. It involves a set of goals or directives being drawn up into government doctrine which, in turn, become translated into educational goals that later get incorporated into a teaching program. The educational system in this case not only reflects the general philosophy of the government through the nationwide teaching system but consciously and deliberately transmits this philosophy.

Researchers in political development tend to conclude that boredom, cynicism, and even antagonism are common responses of youth to explicit ideological indoctrination, and that directed political education or political reform is unlikely to have the results anticipated by national leaders. However, studies like the Koff and Van der Muhll³⁸ work on Kenya and Tanzania indicate that political education might not be rejected as a means of nation-building. Their portrait of future citizens of Kenya and Tanzania, based on student responses to questions about attitudes regarding government, self and the nation, is one of students prepared to face the task of ruling a new nation. Specifically the portrait is of:

.... citizens for whom hard work counts for more than political activism, for whom traditions have lost their hold without being replaced by political ideology for whom educational advantage has not led to a demand for privilege, or whom strong support for the existing political regimes is mixed with a disposition toward critical appraisal of individual performance in political roles³⁹.

Though all new nations cannot expect the same attitudes to prevail in their youth and/or have made little effort to direct the educational system toward the production of "good citizens", there is a desire to build a nation, and to integrate the disparate elements of society into a total unit. And the educational system is still seen by many national leaders as one means of achieving national integration -- at least integration of the youth of the nation.

A summary of opinion regarding nation-building in Africa would conclude that the new states of Africa feel the need to modernize, resocialize and renationalize their societies in order to bring about national integration and economic development. They see the educational system as the natural vehicle for this transformation because it is available, and possibly the most effective means of creating a cultural milieu for change in transitional societies. These new nations see their tasks as resocialization rather than socialization because adults in the society as well as most of the children, have already been socialized to traditional values and goals by families, churches, peer groups, etc.

There is, in addition, a felt need among some nations to renationalize and modernize the educational systems that were inherited at independence because teachers, structures, administration, and curricula of the systems are colonial and are designed to perpetuate colonialism. Change then is necessary if these systems are to become tools for creating nationalists and for developing an effective base of support for change. Farther, a philosophy for an education for liberation is necessary in order to prepare

the educational systems for the transition from resocializing agents to agents of socialization in the new states. Nation-building is positively related to education in Africa, and a necessary, though not sufficient condition for an education for liberation is a nationalist doctrine and a means for transmitting it to the people. The success of socialization through the educational system, is dependent, in part, on the support of other agents of socialization, especially the family. For in these new nations where there are high illiteracy rates, and where the educational systems do not reach all of the population, and those reached often do not remain in school long enough to be effectively socialized, the media, peer groups, and other informal sources of socialization are very important.

In conclusion, I would like to suggest that though I champion the importance of education to the attainment of liberation, educators or people who use the information gathered by educators for nation-building, must confront and address several questions if it is to be used effectively: (1) ideology, what are the short and long range goals of a people and what are acceptable ways of stating and transforming this ideology into practical objectives and goals or policy making? How should the resources of a society (legal, material, human) be used? How must the alignments relate to each other and be regulated in conformity with needs, efficiency as well as philosophical principles underlying the system? (2) Symbolism and structure. What images, slogans, institutions legitimize and explain the philosophical and material situation of a society? How best to organize so as to

regulate the conflict and difficulties resulting from the resocialization of populations, past traditions, individual vs. group interests, priorities of development? (3) Planning. How is nation-building philosophy translated into policy? How are growth and development paralleled? What is the role of people vis-a-vis things in a nation? And what is the relationship between ideas, people and abstract matters of a society?

All of these factors involve a broad based consciousness of the role of directed education in the struggle for liberation and in the process of nation-building. They suggest that purposeful education is not only helpful in the liberation struggle, but essential. Well formulated ideas transformed into well planned objectives which are translated into structures and symbols that are transmitted to the population may not insure liberation for a society, but we can conclude that in the absence of purposeful education the possibility of building a viable nation is practically nil. The role of education then is to guide, define and aid those in the struggle to perpetuate and clarify their goals and objectives and to foster protracted struggle toward the end of building nations based on humane values and humane responses to society's needs whether in North America or on the continent.

REFERENCES CITED/FOOTNOTES

¹Edward Shils, Political Development in the New States (The Hague: Mouton and Co., 1972, pp. 9-10.).

²Aristide N. Zolberg, "Patterns of National

Integration", J. Modern African Studies, Vol. 5, no. 4, 1967, p. 467.

³Ibid., p. 461.

⁴Leonard Binder, "National Integration and Political Development", Amer. Pol. Sci. Rev. LVIII, 1964, pp. 622-631.

⁵Harvey G. Kebschull, Politics in Transitional Societies (N.Y.: Appleton-Century Crofts, 1968, p. 6).

⁶Kothori Rajani, "Introduction: Variations and Uniformities in Nation Building", Intern. Soc. Sci. J., Vol. 23, no. 3, 1971, UNESCO, p. 347.

⁷Ibid., p. 347.

⁸Preface to James Coleman, Education and Political Development (Princeton: Princeton U. Press, 1965, pp. vi-vii).

⁹Kebschull, Politics in Transitional Societies, p. 17

¹⁰Ibid., p. 16.

¹¹Rajani, "Introduction" p. 341.

¹²Arnold Rivkin, Nation-Building in Africa: Problems and Prospects (New Brunswick: Rutgers U. Press, 1969, p. 6).

¹³Michael Lofchife, The State of the Nations: Constraints on Development in Independent Africa (Berkeley: U. Calif. Press, 1971, p.5).

¹⁴Rivkin, Nation-Building in Africa, p. 13.

¹⁵This statement was made during a panel sponsored by the Center for Civic Education, Southern Univ., at the 1971 Annual Meeting of the La. Educ. Assoc., Baton Rouge, La.

¹⁶Julius Nyerere, Freedom and Socialism

(London: Oxford U. Press, 1965).

¹⁷W. E. B. DeBois, The Education of Black People, H. Aptheker, editor (Amherst: U. of Mass. Press, 1973, p. XI).

¹⁸Martin Carnoy, Education as Cultural Imperialism (N.Y.: David McKay, 1974).

¹⁹Institute of the Black World, Education and Black Struggle.

²⁰Ivan Illich, Deschooling Society (N.Y.: Harper & Row, 1971).

²¹Colin Greer, The Solution as Part of Problem (N.Y.: Harper & Row, 1973, pp.1-3).

²²Robert Newley and David Tuyock, "Victims Without Crimes: Some Historical Perspectives on Black Education" J. Negro Educ., Fall, 1971.

²³Alan Westin, "Civic Education in a Crisis Age", Newsletter Center for Teach. Intern. Relations, Denver, Vol. 3, 1971.

²⁴Price Cobb and William Grier, Black Rage (N.Y.: Basic Books, 1968, pp. 134-135).

²⁵See for example Charles Andrain, Children and Civic Awareness; Dawson and Prewitt, Political Socialization (Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1968), Edward Greenberg, Political Socialization (N.Y.: Atherson Press, 1970), David Easton and Robert Hess, "The Child's Political World", Midwest J. of Pol. Soc., VI, 1962. A number of works in the field of political socialization address the problem of acquisition of political attitudes, few deal with the relationship between oppressive systems and miseducation.

²⁶C. Beyer, "Attitudes of American Students about Africa", J. Negro History, 1968.

²⁷Larry Jackson and William Johnson published a volume on Protest by the Poor (Mass.: D.C. Heath & Co., 1974), but even this does not examine the racial, institutional and theoretical parameters of the problem to the extent needed.

²⁸Alan Peshkin, "Education and National Integration in Negeria", J.of Mod. African Studies, Vol. 5, no. 3, p. 323.

²⁹John Prewitt and Joseph Okello Occuli, "Political Socialization and Political Education in New Nations", IN: Roberta Siegel, Learning About Politics, p. 620.

³⁰David Koff and George Van derMehll, "Political Socialization in Kenya and Tanzania: A Comparative Analysis", J. of Modern African Studies, Vol. 5, no. 1, 1967, p. 15).

³¹James Coleman, Education and Political Development, p. 3.

³²See for example, James Coleman, Educ. and Pol. Development; Edward Shils, Political Development in New States; and Shelby Smith: "Nation-Building in Tunisia. The Impact of Education and Socialization", Unpublished dissertation, U. of New Orleans, 1973.

³³Coleman, op. cit.

³⁴For a discussion of this point, see J. Nyerere's Freedom and Socialization; K. Busia's Purposeful Education; and Adams and Bjork's Education in Developing Areas.

³⁵Allan Peshkin, op. cit., pp. 337-352.

³⁶Coleman, op. cit., p. 3.

³⁷Prewitt and Okello, op. cit., pp. 613-614.

³⁸Koff and Van derMuhll, op. cit.

³⁹Ibid., p. 51

Other BALAMP Books About Black Americans . . .

WALK QUIETLY THROUGH THE NIGHT AND CRY SOFTLY, Burniece Avery. 1977, 204 pp., cloth \$7.00, LC #77-2891, ISBN 0-913642-08-8.

The chilling true story of a black family which decided to leave York, Ala. in 1911 in search of a better life. The author is a well-known actress of stage and television; a playwright and stage director.

BLACK AMERICAN SCHOLARS — A STUDY OF THEIR BEGINNINGS, Horace Mann Bond. 1972, 210 pp; cloth \$8.95, ISBN 0-913642-01-0; soft cover \$3.95, ISBN 0-913642-04-5; LC #72-78234.

Dr. Bond traced the ancestral roots of some distinguished black American families to an African Princess brought to the U. S. in 1749.

NEGROES IN SCIENCE: NATURAL SCIENCE DOCTORATES, 1876-1969. James M. Jay. 1971, 99 pp, paperback \$2.50, LC #74-28394, ISBN 0-913642-00-2.

A profile study of 587 of the then-estimated total of 650 American-born blacks to earn doctorates in the natural sciences.

MY WORLD OF REALITY, the autobiography of Hildrus A. Poindexter, M.D., Ph.D. 1973, 349 pp, cloth \$9.95, LC #72-85752, ISBN 0-913642-03-7.

Dr. Poindexter is one of the top five black American physician-scientists of all times. He was the only black tropical disease specialist in uniform during World War II.

ROBESON: LABOR'S FORGOTTEN CHAMPION, Charles H. Wright, M.D. 1975, 178 pp, cloth \$7.95, LC #74-79061, ISBN 0-913642-06-1.

A detailed history and study of Robeson's active involvement in the labor movement in the U. S. and abroad by a serious Robeson scholar who founded the Afro-American Museum of Detroit.



